National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 42. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1866. WHOLE NO. 1342.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York

☞ ALL LETTERS on Business, or for Publication, should be addressed to PARKER PILLSBURY, *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

CLUB RATES.—Ten copies to one address, $2.50 each; twenty copies, $2 each.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, PRINTER,

No. 33 BEEKMAN STREET, N. Y.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

"OUR CINCINNATI COTEMPORARY."

From the Northwestern Presbyterian.

[The *Northwestern Presbyterian* "is a religious newspaper" (so calls itself), published in Chicago. The *Presbyter* is also a religious paper, in Cincinnati. The latter has perpetrated some grave offence against the former, either of omission, commission, or both, for which it receives the following *gentle* and *brotherly* reproof. We are interested in the contest, because one grievance against the *Presbyter* is, that "*it plumes itself*" on having been (and we hope is still), "*identified with the abolition movement.*" Another sin of the offending *Presbyter* is, that he thinks his brother, the *Presbyterian*, "publishes editorials that are unsound." The number before us compels the belief that this charge may be but too well grounded. However, let it speak for itself:]

THE *Presbyter* is in trouble in regard to the *Northwestern Presbyterian*. It has devoted another column to our paper. It would fain persuade its readers that some of the views presented in our editorials were unsound. It would like to raise the cry of "mad dog" if it could. But its alarm is so great, and its real object, though somewhat disguised, is so apparent, that persons of any discrimination are simply amused at its tirades.

Tried by what standard are the views which we presented unsound? By the word of God or the standards of the church? By no means. There is no attempt to show this. By what then? By the *Presbyter's* own self-constituted criteria. Wonderful! A paper beyond all controversy of the least respectability published in the church, setting up its own dicta, as law, and constituting a tribunal, by which to try the soundness of the views of others in all respects, to say the least, his peers.

But the editor of the *Presbyter* plumes himself on his having been early identified with the abolition movement, and the part he has borne in that agitation.

We make a distinction between bold and manly discussion, and persistent and unwise agitation. But does the fact that God in His all wise Providence has overruled the infatuation and wickedness of men, in the removal of a great social and moral evil, which they had not the wisdom to handle or dispose of, prove that those who participated in such agitation, acted wisely, were governed by right motives or were actuated by a kind and Christian spirit? If God causes the wrath of man to praise him, does that prove that that wrath was right, commendable or to be gloried in. It was not the object at which men of extreme views, of unwise measures, and often of unsound principles, aimed, that the wise and good of the church and the land, were opposed to, but the spirit, means and principles by which they were governed, and as calculated to defeat rather than accomplish the end proposed, and to do harm rather than good. The *Presbyter* would fain persuade the public that Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Gerrit Smith and Joseph Monfort, were a very wise class of men, and that Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Archibald Alexander, George Junkin, Robert J. Breckinridge, and scores of others, were sadly wanting in "an understanding of the times," and in a wise and intelligent zeal for the right. They can believe such nonsense who will, but all discriminating and sensible people, the *Presbyter* will find it hard to persuade that a man who proves himself to be an injudicious and unsafe counsellor, by the course which he persistently pursued and the company which he habitually kept before the war, is anything else still, whatever changes, or however great a revolution of sentiment the mad infatuation of men and the overruling providence of God, in other respects may have produced.

The editor of the *Presbyter* seems to think that his anti-slavery zeal is to cover all his sins, and sanctify all the weapons he may wield against his brethren, just as that unblushing infidel, Thomas Paine, imagined that his "Common Sense," and "Rights of Man," ought to cover the atrocities of his "Age of Reason." We commend the following, from one of the late numbers of the *Christian Intelligencer, one of the most loyal and judicious religious journals published in the land.*

"We would like to see a carefully prepared tract or pamphlet 'on the mistakes and failures of the anti-slavery movement,' not simply because the treatment of these themes would have a certain measure of historic interest, but that the truth might be demonstrated, that the abolition movement has been a costly failure, because of the mistaken spirit which directed it.

"We have never had any sympathy for slavery, have never written in its defence, have not apologized for its apologists, and have never voted to extend it or to crown it with political honors. It is now ended. As an institution it is dead and beyond the possibility of a resurrection. But criticism, philosophy, political facts, and the spirit of Him who is true, forbid that the Abolitionists should claim or share any credit for having overthrown slavery. They are entitled to this award and no more—that they compacted and consolidated the political and religious feelings of the South in defence of slavery, until those feelings became passions blind enough and almost strong enough to destroy the Union of these States.

"Just now sundry papers are raking through Webster's unabridged lexicon to draw up epithets in praise of Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison and his *Liberator*. This may be a pleasant pastime for those who have a knack for creating theories which have no correspondence with facts. Moreover, the "*you tickle me and i'll tickle you society*," has its Valhalla to be filled with gods and demigods. What a pity if it were once vacant! Rome canonizes doubtful saints—why should not humanitarianism imitate the hierarchy?

"But they who have a more sure word of prophecy should not be misled by a roar of verbose *jubilates*. Abolitionism, as a reformatory movement, was a complete and disastrous failure. It helped what it sought to harm. Inflamed with anger, wrath, malice, and all uncharitableness, it did the work of the evil one in the name of the Holiest."

[Another sample of this CHRISTIAN *Intelligencer*, so highly complimented and so ostentatiously introduced above, is contained in the following. If the "*unblushing infidel, Thomas Paine*," can bear these Christians, surely, they should in good taste tolerate him. To italicise a few passages, is the only liberty taken with the article.]

NORTH AND SOUTH.

It is with no small regret that we notice a disposition on the part of a very few of our religious cotemporaries, to keep up a controversy between the North and the South, for which there is no longer, on either side, a reasonable justification. The long and bitter quarrel over slavery has been terminated by the verdict of Divine Providence. But we of the North are surely not so ignorant of the nature of awakened passions, as to suppose that they will subside on the instant the provocative causes of their excitement are taken away. For thirty years the *Christian people of the South were "set for the defence of" slavery.* Their devotion to it seemed to increase with the volume of opposition they were obliged to encounter. One church after another split on that rock, and we saw denominations of national scope divided into separate bands. Such was the attitude of these churches, North and South, before the war.

That the Christian people of the South meant to be, and thought themselves to be conscientious in the advocacy and support of the "peculiar" institution, cannot be questioned for a moment. When at length the war came on, their principles, feelings, and consciences were all fervently enlisted in behalf of the Confederacy. *They believed they were doing God service in adhering to the fortunes of the political leaders of the South.* Northern Christians thought their Southern brethren to be grievously in error, and Southern Christians cordially reciprocated the exercise of this charity in their own way towards their brethren of the North. But He who makes the wrath of man to praise Him, *out of the very fires of a tumultuous controversy has brought the radiant angel—Peace.* The root of bitterness has been consumed, and nothing of it remains except the straggling smoke of its decaying embers. Slavery, and that alone, produced alienations and animosities between North and South; and that is gone. The recollection of the strife, however, remains to both its parties, and the relics of its devastating fury have not vanished from the sight. As the disquietude of the ocean is long visible after the storm which produced it has passed, so there is still on the surface of the national mind some lingering evidences of the tempest which but so lately moved it to its uttermost depths.

In the moral world, time, reflection, and charity are essential ingredients in the cup of healing. And remembering how potent they are in working the cure of social and religious differences, there should be faith in their ability to reunite broken ties, and restore to confidence alienated kinsmen.

We know the temper of the Northern far better than we do that of the Southern mind. Yet we are not ignorant of what appears in the columns of our Southern exchanges. From them we draw the conclusion that the main complaint they have to make against the North is, that the motives, the principles, and the spirit of Southern Christians in the recent conflict have been misjudged, and that they will not repent of having been rebels, when, according to their light, they believed rebellion to be a virtue—nay, an act of Christian duty. They strenuously protest against all resolutions of Northern assemblies, conferences, and conventions which require them to make confession of their sin in this particular—*and really we do not know how they can make such confession in good conscience, so long as they religiously believe they were originally right in maintaining opposition to the national authorities.*

Confident as we are that the Christian people of the North will never surrender their judgment of the merits of the late civil conflict, still we are quite sure they are willing to regard the past as a sealed-up record, and henceforth study the things which make for peace, and things which accompany salvation. Every Southern man of intelligence and candor, who has been at the North since April last, has assuredly learned that here no other feelings than those of a generous brotherhood are entertained among all classes. The well-nigh universal wish is to have the work of "reconstruction" in all its parts, civil and religious, completed as quickly as possible. The common good of the whole country requires that this result should be attained in as brief a space as possible. While the commercial and political relations of North and South are being restored, any studied attempts, from whatever quarter they may proceed, to keep apart those whom God has made one in the faith of the same Lord is a double crime.

The proceedings of the General Assembly at Macon, the discussions in Baptist and Methodist journals South, are not without symptoms of a progressive return to the intimacies of Christian communion with kindred disciples at the North. We hail the appearance of these symptoms with grateful pleasure, and shall regret to see any extra-judicial proceedings taken by religious bodies at the North. The question above all others is, *Can the churches of the two sections be brought together on the platform of their accepted creeds, usages, and discipline? If they can, by-gones should be by-gones—and with one faith, one Lord, and one baptism, they may move together against the kingdom of evil.*

Selections.

REPUBLICAN NOMINATIONS IN CONNECTICUT.

[Last week the Republicans of Connecticut met, it is said, in the largest State Convention they ever held there, and nominated as candidate for Governor, Gen. Joseph R. Hawley. To nominate candidates for important offices, even in the State, has grown to be the most delicate business our ardent and devoted patriots are called to perform. The negro is in every woodpile, on every fence. He is in every speech in Congress, and in every platform, of Convention, or caucus, a constant, but dreaded omnipresence. How to avoid him, and yet embrace him, is pretended Republican Reconstruction. How to embrace him, and still avoid him, spurn him clear back to slavery itself if possible, that is Democratic Reconstruction. Both parties are willing to put him to any use which will best subserve party interests; neither caring more for him on other grounds, than did Senator Douglas, when he is said to have declared he "did not care a d—n for the nigger either way; but slavery wouldn't pay in Kansas, and so had better not go there." Nominating conventions are expected to perform a more critical work than ever Blondin attempted on his rope, or the most expert circus rider on his horses. Blondin never walks from the two opposite banks of the river at the same time. The circus-rider bestrides two and sometimes three horses; but they always gallop in the same direction. More complicated feats are expected of the manager in a nominating convention, where his horses run North and South and with telegraphic swiftness, every moment.

The remarks of the *Herald* below describe Democratic Conventions and doings, as well as the action of the Convention of Republicans in Connecticut. It will be a glad day to the country when the people discover and disown the tricks and juggleries by which it is now blindly ruled.]

THE Republican State Convention of Connecticut has done its work and adjourned. Its State ticket, headed by Gen. Joseph R. Hawley, a popular soldier from the war, is a strong one, and its platform is carefully contrived to float between Scylla and Charybdis—the President and Congress—without being broken upon the rock or engulfed in the whirlpool. In other words, the Republican party of Connecticut, with the dash of a trained equestrian, undertakes to ride both horses, and to hold them neatly together around the course.

The Convention first puts in a resolution declaring that "we gladly express our confidence in the integrity, ability and patriotism of Andrew Johnson, and do pledge him our hearty support in his labors for a just, complete and permanent restoration of the Union." This is "as broad and general as the casing air," yet it shrewdly avoids all specifications. But now look at the other horse—the resolution upon Congress—to wit: "That in the Union majority of the present Congress we recognize a noble array of true and tried defenders of the principles of constitutional liberty and order, and that we repose with confidence in their wisdom and patriotism for the settlement of the questions appropriately pertaining to the legislative department of the government."

But this is not all. The Republican party of Connecticut further declares its reliance "upon all the departments of the government to co-operate in securing by every necessary guarantee the measures that have already been indicated by executive and legislative action—namely, the extinction of the doctrine of secession, the complete destruction of slavery in fact as well as in name, and the enactment of appropriate laws to assure to every class of citizens the full enjoyment of the rights and immunities accorded to all by the Constitution of the United States." In looking into this meal tub there is nothing visible but meal, and yet an old rat would be apt to suspect that there was a cat concealed in it. "The enactment of appropriate laws" may mean this thing, that thing or the other; but as this is the universal trick of party platforms on dangerous party issues we may let it go.

In their hearty endorsement of Andrew Johnson, however, the Republicans of Connecticut show that they understand the drift of public opinion. They know that his policy of Southern restoration has taken a firm hold upon the popular mind, and that if they break with him they go to pieces. They shrink from any recognition of the extreme measures of Thaddeus Stevens; they have nothing to say of the bill providing for unqualified negro suffrage in the District of Columbia—nothing in support of the doings of Stevens and the Reconstruction Committee. They deal in "glittering generalities," but they "gladly express our confidence in the interity, ability and patriotism of Andrew Johnson."

[The following from the *World* is equally just as a criticism, and alike applicable to both parties. The only object of this extended article is to open the eyes of the people to the cheats and plots for which American politicians are becoming infamously notorious, as far as they are known.]

The proceedings of the Republican Convention in Connecticut show that the Republican party in that State rely on their ability to confuse the true issue as their only ground of hope. Gen. Hawley, their candidate for Governor, is selected solely because he is a military man; his party not daring to run a political candidate. By sinking politics, and running their candidate on the obsolete question of the war, they hope to obscure, or keep out of sight, the dividing line between the policy of President Johnson and that of the Republican party. Their platform is constructed in the same view. It attempts to ride two horses. It gives a hollow indorsement to President Johnson, and a real indorsement to the present Congress; although all men of sense know that their respective policies are diametrically opposite. This shuffling attempt to confound a known difference, betrays their consciousness that, in an honest canvass, they would have no chance of carrying the State.

CONGRESS.

[The proceedings in the Senate on Wednesday of last week were worthy of note, as below:]

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

AT 1 o'clock the proposed amendment to the Constitution was taken up. Mr. Henderson contended against the taxation of negroes, if they were not to be represented, as an unjust principle, and endorsed the amendment of Mr. Sumner, offered yesterday, to exempt from taxation negroes who are not represented. The proposition of the Committee, he said, was a proposition saying that the Southern States might exclude the negroes from the right of suffrage. This he characterized as a compromise.

Mr. Henderson said that the negroes would not receive justice from the white people of the South. They would be defrauded in every way of their civil and political rights. Under the proposition of the Committee, in the State of Virginia, 548,907 negroes would be excluded from representation, which would be a number nearly equal to the white population of the States of Kansas, Delaware, Minnesota and Florida. These States had six Representatives and eight Senators. The same was true of other Southern States. The negro population of Georgia and South Carolina amounted to 878,018, largely more than the white population of New-Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island, which States have six Senators and eight Representatives. Add the negro population of Virginia, and you have a larger number than the white population of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island.

Mr. Henderson said he advocated the enfranchisement of the negroes because it was right, and he believed if right it would certainly succeed. If the object of the Committee of Fifteen was to secure suffrage for the negroes, they had not taken the right way to accomplish it. The proposition of the Committee would not give the right of suffrage to negroes in the North, and in this respect it was unjust. The right to force negro suffrage upon the South could only be derived from the right of representation to those who are taxed, and this applied to the North as well as to the South.

Mr. Henderson hoped that the proposition of the Special Committee would not be adopted; it would have the amendment of Mr. Sumner's exempting from taxation all who are not represented added to it.

Mr. Henderson was commenting upon Mr. Sumner's joint resolution to grant suffrage to the negroes, when

Mr. Yates desired to ask a question. He said: Congress has passed a Constitutional Amendment, which has been ratified, abolishing slavery in all the States—in other words securing freedom to freedmen. Can full freedom be conferred upon freedmen without conferring all their rights—natural, civil and political? Can this be done? The second clause of the Amendment says that Congress shall have full power to do it—to confer full freedom upon the freedmen. Abolishing slavery means it. Another point. Congress before the adoption of this Amendment could not make a citizen. A State could not make a citizen. We, the people of the United States, do ordain and establish this Constitution. The people made the Constitution, not the Constitution the people. The Dred Scott decision declared that because a slave could be bought and sold, because at that time he was not recognized as a member of society, because he had no rights which a white man was bound to respect, therefore he was not one of the Sovereignty. By the amendment to the Constitution the freedman becomes what—a subject or a sovereign? He is emancipated into the United States, Congress having no power to make a citizen, except to naturalize a foreigner, the States having no right whatever to make a citizen, although a State may regulate and make rules by which he may vote. The freedman, the moment he became free, became one of the people of the United States. The question which I wish to propound to the Senator from Missouri is, "Why we should ask for a Constitutional amendment when we have the power under an amendment just adopted to secure, not in South Carolina and Georgia, but in the Union, freedom for all freedmen, civil and political, emancipation to every man?

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Yates if there is slavery or involuntary servitude in Illinois?

Mr. Yates said there was not. There could not be under the amendment recently adopted.

Mr. Henderson—But Illinois does not allow her negroes to vote.

Mr. Yates—That is what I propose to get at by a bill of Congress, which shall secure political and civil rights to all these men.

Mr. Henderson—I will ask the Senator from Illinois another question—Whether the women of Illinois are free or slaves?

Mr. Yates—I notice, sir, that when gentlemen are driven to to the wall on this question they ask why we don't let the women vote. I will answer that at the proper time.

Mr. Henderson—I am only talking of a question of power. I am not disputing the proposition that the negro ought to have the right of suffrage. I am disputing about the power to do it. The Senator from Massachusetts proposes to do by a bill of Congress what I propose to do by a Constitutional amendment.

Mr. Henderson then took up his own proposition to amend the Constitution by prohibiting any State from withholding suffrage on account of color. Referring to a conversation between himself and the President in October last, he said that the President told him that the negro ought to be enfranchised.

Mr. Clark of N. H. next spoke on the proposition before the Senate. Six years ago, he said, Senator Brown of Mississippi, then Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, brought in a bill to establish schools in this District. It provided for the taxation of whites and blacks for the education of whites only. He (Clark) offered an amendment, setting apart the taxes paid by the black men for the education of black children, but Mr. Brown would not accept the amendment, and finding the Senate disposed to adopt it, he put the bill aside. He did not believe that this was exclusively a government of white men. It was a government of all men, for all men and all classes.

No citizen is so high as to escape its obligations, nor none so low as to be beyond its protection. Our fathers did not make this a government of white men or of black men, but of all men. To those who were sick of this controversy he would say that it would end when the black man was treated with equal justice and equality with the white man. If he had ever held that this was exclusively a white man's government, he would be ashamed to say so now, after the sacrifice of the black man to save the Government. He referred at some length to the achievements of the black soldiers in the late war to refute the assertion that this was a white man's government. Not only because the black man fought did he (Clark) demand equal rights for him, but because he had a right to them as a citizen who had assisted in the formation of the Government. The black man had as good a right to say the white man should not vote as the white man had to say the black man should not vote in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Clark was opposed to exacting any qualifications for colored suffrage. People talked of requiring a probationary period from negroes, but what probations did they exact from negroes? He (Mr. Clark) would rather have, without probation, the vote of the loyal black man who periled his life to save the Government than the vote of the Rebel white man without probation. If the Government wanted to arm 10,000 blacks or whites—blacks, of course—then let the ballots go with the bullets; both are dangerous weapons in wrong hands. The man who has intelligence enough to know the right side to fight on has intelligence enough to know the right side to vote on. In Mississippi they are disarming the loyal blacks and arming the Rebel militia.

Mr. Wade—The President did that.

Mr. Clark—I was not saying who did it. I was calling attention to the foolishness of the act. Mr. Clark advocated the enfranchisement of the blacks as a better means of protection to them than the Freedmen's Bureau was. Referring to the question of reconstruction, he said he would not now vote for the admission of any State, *except perhaps Tennessee*, to participation in the affairs of the Government. He did not think it would be safe. He would never vote for the admission of Senators who had taken an active part in the Rebellion. While the Southern States were States in the Union they were also States in Rebellion.

The Senate at 5 p. m. adjourned.

Mr. Wade presented a petition from the colored people of Arkansas, asking for political equality with the white race; which was referred to the Committee on Reconstruction.

Mr. Sumner presented the memorial of the colored delegation that recently waited upon the President, protesting against the passage of the pending Constitutional Amendment in relation to representation. It was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Reconstruction.

Mr. Trumbull (Ill.) presented a petition for equal rights, and the abolition of distinctions on account of color amongst the soldiers of the United States Army. The Bill as presented by Senator Wilson prohibits the promotion of colored soldiers from the ranks, and establishes a military aristocracy of color. Such an exclusion is a base concession to pro-slavery fanaticism.

The Senate also passed a bill to punish kidnapping by fine of from $500 to $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

A SOUTHERN HIT AT THE "YANKEES."

THE Boston *Transcript* says: "The Petersburg (Va.) *Index*, stirred up by the observation that Samuel Adams had a larger share than Thomas Jefferson in bringing on the Revolution, indulges in the following strain of irony, which has the element of fun in it—an ingredient not often found in Southern outbreaks against the North. If the *Index* will always be as amusing the most bigoted descendant of the Puritans will say to it: 'Fire away, my good fellow. Give us more of the same sort:'

"'Our private opinion and belief are that there are authentic documents now in the library of Yale College—or they will be there when needed—to prove that Bunker Hill Monument marks the site of Babylon the Mighty, that Carthage was no more nor less than Portland, Ostrium, Nahant and Boston, in fact, Athens; that Homer was Professor of Belles-Lettres at Harvard, and Patinorus a member of the Cambridge Yacht Club; that Priscian taught a grammar school at Montpelier, and Archimedes was a private tutor of chemistry in Concord; that St. Peter was a Cape Cod fisherman, and St. Matthew a collector of the internal revenue at Stonington; that Phidias owned a brown stone quarry in Maine; and Socrates founded the *Atlantic Monthly;* that the Academia was the walk under the yew trees at New Haven, and the Colossus of Rhodes a statue which strided from Nantucket to Martha's Vineyard; that Plymouth Rock is all that is left of the Tower of Babel, and the Connecticut River ran through Paradise; that Stonington is the site of Tyre, and Merrimac the *fast colors* dyes that made that city famous; that the old Temple of Diana at Ephesus was not burned, but is now Faneuil Hall, and that Herodotus and Wendell Phillips were the same person; that the fable of Romulus and his brother being suckled by a wolf *(lupus)* arose from the circumstance that their mother was the first Vermonter who *looped* her dresses; that Mercury was the ancient name of Ben. Butler's family, and that like everything else in New England, the family had gone on perfecting itself from the start; that the sun shines six hours per diem more on that favored spot than on any other between the poles; and that Noah's family were so much elated at an alliance with the Websters of Massachusetts that they got up a dictionary to commemorate that fact; that St. Patrick was head-centre of a Fenian circle in Bangor, and St. Andrew kept a distillery in Lowell; and finally that the millenium will begin in Boston, and will not be allowed to extend beyond its limits, except by a two-thirds vote of the tax-payers of that heavenly city, excluding all who have at any time in their most secret thoughts expressed a doubt of the propriety of hanging Jeff. Davis and General Lee on a sour apple tree.'"

A MORMON DILEMMA.—An article in the *Times* last week said Congress had not yet taken action upon any of the numerous bills that have been introduced for abolishing the system of polygamy in Utah. The fact is, the question is one more difficult to deal with practically than some had supposed. The passage of an act would of course—or rather *should* of course—imply its enforcement; but it is here that the trouble begins. The question cannot be dealt with as slavery was dealt with. The slave was proclaimed free, and the incident of freedom was realized universally through the operations of war. But were polygamy proclaimed as abolished to-morrow, the legal edict would have no force, and could only be made effective by the officers of Government entering every house in Utah and forcing the separations which the law had made necessary.

We find in the Utah *Vedette* (a journal supported by our soldiers and opposed to polygamy) a note of inquiry from a woman who is a fourth wife in a polygamous family. She says:

"Reading in your columns that in all probability polygamy would be done away with, it causes me to inquire what will become of all the women that are situated like myself, the fourth wife of a laboring man, who supports us in comfort by industry and economy, but whose means would be nothing if divided between us all, without his daily income arising from his work? Now what would become of a young woman of hardly twenty-four with five children, the two youngest are twins six months old; and, although a good housekeeper, I am not sufficiently skilled in any one thing to depend on as a means of livelihood. And must my poor children bear the stigma of illegitimacy, as they naturally will, if the tie that binds me to their father is annulled? And how can I seek employment at the hands of those who are not so situated, and who despise me? Please inform me what comfort or happiness you can see for me in the future."

Such cases are certainly hard; but there are thousands of them in Utah. We suppose, whatever action is taken by Congress, these cases will be taken into account.

A NEW REBELLION THREATENED.—The *Herald* says the Kentucky Legislature is making itself supremely ridiculous in the face of the world. The other day it solemnly rejected the great Constitutional Amendment, for the second time, and in this instance after the amendment had been officially proclaimed a part of the Constitution—the supreme law of the land. This is, however, a small affair compared with what follows. Lately a white man, charged with the murder of a black man in Kentucky, was taken, by order of Gen. Fisk and a posse of colored troops, from the civil authorities and turned over to a military camp. Why this was done Gen. Palmer may explain in his statement that the civil authorities afford no justice or protection to the negro in Kentucky. The proceeding, at all events, stirred up the wrath of the State Senate to a high pitch. Mr. Govin thought we were under a centralized despotism; that the military authorities were seeking to degrade Kentucky through mere malevolence; and he said that, "if we cannot get redress in any other way, he was for resistance, even at the point of the bayonet, to determine whether we are freemen or slaves." But Mr. Cochran out-Heroded Herod. Hear him:

"Mr. Cochran denounced the Government as a centralized despotism, and that the community of traitors, with Andrew Johnson at their head, were rushing the country into ruin. The time had not yet come for open resistance; but when it did—when the authorities failed to redress these wrongs—he was for resistance to the death. He would rather die a freeman than live a slave.

CHURCH TO KEEP STEP WITH THE STATE.

From the N. Y. Independent.

THERE is an indissoluble union between the Church and the State. In spite of all our theories and enactments, they are largely one; they have ever been. In heathen and in Christian climes, Judea and Rome, they were substantially one. So are they in America. Our revolution was an outgrowth of the Church no less than of the State. In the cabin of the Mayflower was drawn up the essence of the national creed and constitution. Puritan and Papist, Episcopalian and Presbyterian united in the support of Washington and the Continental Congress.

Why did not our government then go forward in the working out of its true idea? Why did slavery rally when every one supposed it dying? Simply because the churches ceased to oppose it. Church and State disapproved of it, but allowed it. Franklin, *an avowed skeptic*, presided over the first Abolition Society, and headed the first abolition petition to Congress. How was he seconded? Did the churches take up this cause? Did they pour in similar petitions? Did they purify their own fold of the iniquity? Did they not the rather connive at its presence, and content themselves with harmless pellets of protestations, instead of the vigorous cannonade of expulsion? Churches which were located exclusively at the North wrought out their own exclusive salvation through the co-operation of their legislatures. But even they did not wage a vigorous warfare against its national protection. They did not petition Congress against passing the first Fugitive Slave Bill, nor remonstrate with the great Washington for signing it. They did not declare "no slaveholder shall be recognized by us as a Christian, whether he solicits admission to our ministry or membership." Thus the Church palsied the arm of the State, and both fell into a slumber, such as rested upon Egypt in that night when God's angel passed over it. A slumber, too, from which they were aroused, like those sleepers, only by the cry of their own children, dying, through all the land.

We are awake to-day. Let us beware how we fall asleep again. *How shall we keep awake?* Only by going forward. Congress has given the Church the key-note. Will she respond? How shall she respond? First, by sending to Congress her congratulations for its courageous course, and petitions for like faithfulness in the yet greater duties before it. Second, and chiefly, by corresponding action in her own sphere. She now distinguishes her children and churches by this badge of shame and sin. In her sphere of authority let her do as Congress is doing in its sphere. Let not her existing Churches cultivate or allow the recognition of this most unchristian distinction. Let her look this duty of to-day square in the face. What does it mean? Only this; that we should pay no more regard to the color of one's skin than to the color of his eyes or hair. Whoever is called of God to preach his gospel should be accessible to all his pulpits. If he be in all other repects such as the people would select as their pastor, this peculiarity should not prevent their welcoming him in this relation. Such an institution as a colored Church should instantly cease to exist. The reasons for their existence are our dislike to mingle with these our brethren as fellow-worshippers, and our refusal to receive the ministers of this complexion as our pastors. The last is the strongest hold of this prejudice. Yet it must come down. It is against the spirit and the letter of the gospel. It is abhorrent especially in the sight of God. For it treats his chosen and accredited ambassadors with contempt and loathing, because of a peculiarity given them of him and approved by him. Let, then, every church see to it that she abolishes this unrighteous distinction among her members. Let her purge her own District of Columbia of this sin. Let her cheerfully take her colored brethren and sisters by the hand, and welcome them to her pews, her altar, her fellowship, her honors, her entire ecclesiastical life and love.

Let her boldly invite brethren of this complexion to her pastorates. Why should Rev. Sella Martin be proscribed as a pastor on account of his complexion? Why should not Broome street, or Madison avenue, or the Tremont Temple, or any other influential Baptist church, invite this foremost of her ministers to their pastorate? Why should not a new church be organized on this avowed principle, and invite him to be its pastor? Such an act would be signally blessed of God. Why should Rev. Dr. Garnett be constrained to superintend only colored Presbyterians? Let his brethren of his order invite this eminent preacher to their pulpits. What a glory would break from the countenance of the great Head of the Church over those who should thus inaugurate Bible Christianity in America. Many a Congregational church can thus show its faith by such fitting and glorious works. The Methodist Church can invite not a few of these able and eloquent ministers to its conferences and appointments, and the great iniquity of caste thus receive the first and most effectual blow upon its accursed head.

Thus doing, we can go South aright. Even as Congress has found it necessary to purify its district before it assumed to purge the rebellious States of like transgressions, so would the church, thus cleansed, be prepared to enter upon its great work of subduing the South in righteousness. She is in danger now of perpetuating and expanding this sin in her operations there. She is busy building colored churches and organizing colored schools. She is thus bringing forth fruit after her kind. All this should be instantly abandoned. No church or school should be organized as white or colored. If she cannot abolish those existing, she can, at least, refuse to increase their number. Everywhere, and with unyielding tenacity, must she cling to this fundamental law of the gospel, if she would have fruit that shall remain.

MAINE AND WISCONSIN ON RECONSTRUCTION.—On the 14th inst., in the Maine Legislature, *under a suspension of the rules*, Mr. Payson (Democrat) offered to the House a series of resolves declaring that it should be the first desire and prayer of every citizen, and the chief aim of every statesman, that the lately insurgent States should be speedily restored to their former orbits; that all factious opposition merits and receives stern reprobation; *that President Johnson is entitled to our warmest thanks for his earnest efforts in that regard;* that all petitions and applications from abroad for the punishment of offences committed against the Government, belong rather to a barbarous than to a civilized people; that the Government being clothed with power for such punishment and being itself the best and only judge of the same, all such petitions and applications are uncalled for, unreasonable, and prejudicial to the true interests of the country.

Subsequently Mr. Stearns (Union) offered the following:

Resolved, That this Legislature express its entire confidence in the integrity, ability and patriotism of President Andrew Johnson, who defied secession in the Senate and defied rebellion in Tennessee; who sprang from the people and is identified with their interests; and the loyal citizens of Maine will give him their hearty support in his labors for a complete and permanent restoration of the Union on the basis of liberty and impartial justice.

Resolved, That in the Union majority of Congress this Legislature recognizes a noble array of tried defenders of the principles of constitutional liberty, and reposes with confidence in their wisdom and patriotism for settlement of the question appropriately pertaining to the Legislative Department of the Government.

Both were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

[Wisconsin is evidently less afraid of the President's hot displeasure. A dispatch from Madison, on Friday last, said:]

"In the Legislature to-day the Committee on Federal Relations reported a series of resolutions declaring that the safety of the government depends upon adherence to the cardinal principle that all men are created free and equal. While rejoicing over the restoration or the Union, we earnestly protest against any policy of reconstruction which disregards these vital principles and admits the enemies of the Government to participate in its administration. The course pursued by the Southern States since the close of the war toward Northern men, the persecution of colored men, the election of former active rebel leaders to official positions, are evidence that it is unsafe to trust them with the destinies of the nation. The welfare of the loyal people of these States urges upon Congress the duty of establishing provisional governments until the Southern people demonstrate a fitness to resume administration. The state of the Government demands adequate punishment of treason in bringing to trial and punishment the rebel leaders.

The resolutions commend President Johnson's course at the outset of his administration as an evidence of his devotion to the cardinal principles of our Government, pledging him to support so far as he executes faithfully the trust committed to him. These resolutions are considered the unanimous voice of the majority of the members of the Legislature and of the people of this State, and will probably pass at an early day.

PRESIDENTIAL DIGNITY.

[A correspondent of the Worcester (Mass.) *Spy* sends the following account of the interview between the President and the colored delegation lately at the White House:]

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 9, 1866.

THE sensation of the day is of course the President's talk with the colored delegation, and that from Montana, on Wednesday last. Nobody is much surprised or much hurt at the cold-blooded disregard shown, of all lessons taught by these momentous events; yet there cannot help being sorrow in the hearts of many, that, at this late day, Mr. Johnson should blot out all the nobler utterances of his life.

I am able to give you a minute account of the interview had by the colored delegates. The telegraph has informed you who composed the delegation. Mr. George T. Downing, representing the New England States, acts as their president. As the *Intelligencer* and the copperhead press generally declare that the interview was sprung upon the President without warning, and was a plan of the radicals to make Mr. Johnson commit himself, I propose to tell how the interview was brought about. Of course it was part of the delegation's plan to pay their respects to the President, waiting until the arrival of all the delegates. On Monday last, a request was conveyed to the President, through a person acquainted at the White House, and having access to the executive. It was hoped by the delegates that this favor would be extended to them some evening, so that more time might be given for a full expression of views.

On Wednesday morning the delegation received a note informing them their friend had made an appointment at half-past ten of that day. It took them by surprise. How much so, may be judged by the fact that the very elegant, finished and compact address of Mr. Downing was written in the White House while the delegation was waiting admission. It had been agreed among them that Mr. Douglass should be spokesman. He, however, declined, considering it impolitic for him to speak, as he had lately severely criticized the President; nor was it designed to introduce the delegates separately.

On being admitted, however, which was between twelve and one, Mr. Johnson advanced with apparent cordiality and extending his hand. Mr. Downing then introduced the delegates, and proceeded to address the President, who stood by the side of the chair he had occupied. After Mr. Downing finished, Mr. Douglass spoke briefly. There was then a pause, the delegation expecting Mr. Whipper of Philadelphia to speak; as he did not, Mr. Downing remarked "that what had been said expressed fully their hopes and wishes, and the delegation respectfully hoped the President would make a favorable response."

The President seemed slightly confused, placing his foot on a chair, hesitating a little as he commenced his rambling reply. As he proceeded, reaching the point where he spoke of those who in rounded periods expressed their devotion to liberty, etc., his face began to glow, his manner grew animated, and between the pauses of his interjectionary sentences, he spit furiously on the floor, as if he was thus showing his opinion of those Radicals at whom his sarcasm was aimed. The reply proceeded, and as it did the President's manner lost that cordial look which it wore when the delegates entered. Both Mr. Downing and Mr. Douglass tried, without any design on the part of either, to catch and fix Mr. Johnson's eye on themselves. They were the spokesmen, and consequently desired to make any reply that might be necessary. They found it impossible. Mr. Johnson in a marked manner avoided this, and at last fixed his own glance upon the Mississippi delegate, as if he desired through him to affect the balance.

As the President proceeded, Douglass or Downing several times sought to make some answering reply or remark. The President, between the pauses of his talking and spitting, seemed to give them an opportunity—even to invite reply. But before a sentence could be finished, as soon as the point aimed at was visible, the President would interrupt abruptly, and go on with his talk. Of course it was impossible to report these broken sentences. Mr. Johnson showed uneasiness at the interruptions, and evinced a strong desire not to allow any discussion. The remark about the slave despising the poor white man was directly addressed to Douglass. There is but one criticism upon it, and it is that Mr. Johnson showed a strange ignorance of human nature in thus addressing this distinguished man. When the President said "let us draw near and discuss this question," Mr. Douglass, standing in his simple manhood and intellectual dignity, the central figure of the group fully the President's equal in all that constitutes noble character, took him at his word and advanced toward the President. The latter drew back in a repellant manner. When the delegation was leaving, Mr. Douglass said, "The President sends us to the people, and to the people we go." The *Star* of this city, in its report, made Mr. Douglass say in closing, "and we go to make the people right." The difference is important, because the latter concedes that the people are not already right, which the delegates do not admit.

NEW ORLEANS.

REV. MR. MCKEOWN, writing to *Zion's Herald*, Boston, says:

"The most interesting hour I have spent in New Orleans, was one I passed at the colored Orphan Asylum under the superintendence of Madame Louise De Mortie, an accomplished quadroon lady, a Virginian by birth, but well known in Massachusetts. She occupies the splendid mansion of that proudest of rebels, Pierre Soule, on Esplanade street, which, through the kindness of Gen. Sheridan, and especially through her own energy of character, she manages yet to hold for this benevolent purpose, though by order of President Johnson most of the houses of the rebels have been returned to them. She is assisted by a paid teacher from New York, but her own labors are gratuitous, and by giving Shakspearian readings, concerts and lectures, she maintains her establishment without much assistance from the Government.

"The universal testimony from Union men in regard to the President's policy is, that it is ruinous; that it has had the effect to arouse again the spirit of rebellion through

birth or 'Black Republican' proclivities, should make a note of this, and refrain from going where they are not wanted."

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1866.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY DISTINCTION IN CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES AMONG THE NATURALIZED CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES RESIDING WITHIN ITS LIMITS, OR AMONG PERSONS BORN ON ITS SOIL OF PARENTS PERMANENTLY RESIDENT THERE, ON ACCOUNT OF RACE, COLOR, OR DESCENT.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRESS.

THE late Dr. Beecher was once on trial for heresy, before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. A profane wag said one day (oath here omitted), "there is more need of trying the General Assembly before Dr. Beecher." A similar feeling is awakened by reading that a committee, or deputation, of colored gentlemen had waited on the President. The press was not wise in parading so full accounts of the interview before the world. The example of the ancient Hebrews, walking backward and covering the nakedness of their unfortunate father, would have been better, at least for the President. This, however, was not so decreed, and could not be. The Inscrutable Wisdom swept the strange spectacle across the world; and the journals are teeming with it to this hour; and, to their credit be it told, they seem almost universally ashamed of it.

The fearful exhibitions by the President, both of weakness and wickedness, have found excuse or palliation before. In this instance, millions have wished that at least one of the deputation could have been in place of him, for the honor and dignity of the nation. Theologians have contended that neither the denial by one, or betrayal by another of the disciples of Christ, constituted the sin against the Holy Ghost, which is without forgiveness. But had the circumstances attending both offences been combined in either one, it would, they say, have been that dreadful crime, whose perpetrator was an irrecoverable outcast forevermore.

If the blasphemy against the holy spirit of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity (an ever-blessed trinity), was not perpetrated by Andrew Johnson at the late interview, it is safe to conclude that such an offence is beyond the realm of possibilities. His declarations were in direct denial of former professions. They were gross betrayals of the true genius of Freedom and Humanity. They were a crucifixion of Justice herself!—as Lord Chatham would have said "giving justice her death."

Hear him only a year and a half before, at Nashville:

"Colored men of Nashville: You have all heard of the President's proclamation, by which he announced to the world that the slaves in a large portion of the seceded States were thenceforth and forever free. I, too, have a proclamation to make; and, standing here upon the steps of the Capitol, *with the past history of the State to witness, the present condition to guide, and its future to encourage me*, I, Andrew Johnson, *do hereby proclaim freedom, full, broad, and unconditional, to every man in Tennessee!*"

* * * * * * *

"I am almost induced to wish that, as in days of old, a Moses might arise who should lead you safely to the promised land of freedom and happiness."

"We want no Moses but you!" shouted the crowd.

"Well, then," replied the speaker, "humble and unworthy as I am, if no other better shall be found, I will indeed be your Moses, and lead you through the Red Sea of war and bondage to a fairer future of liberty and peace. *I speak now as one who feels the world his country, and all who love equal rights his friends. I speak, too, as a citizen of Tennessee. Loyal men, whether white or black, shall alone control her destinies.*"

The manner of redeeming these solemn pledges constitutes the most important portion of our national history for the last six months, and the darkest page of history in all our hundred years as a people. And when a delegation of gentlemen, some of whom would do honor to our Congress in either House (not to speak of the Presidential chair, as contrasted with its *present occupant*), seek an interview with the Chief Magistrate, they are coolly dismissed with the taunt that if they do not like their present condition, the world, (or the abyss, evidently immaterial to him), is before them to seek another habitation.

The Presidential dignity and general deportment are well described by an eye-witness in another column of THE STANDARD to-day. A part of the colloquy is copied below from a journal well known to be most friendly to the Administration:

Mr. Douglass.—I have to return you our thanks, Mr. President, for so kindly granting us this interview. We did not come here expecting to argue this question with your Excellency, but simply to state what were our views and wishes in the premises. If we were disposed to argue the question, and you would grant us permission, of course we would endeavor to controvert some of the positions you have assumed.

Mr. Downing.—Mr. Douglass, I take it that the President, by his kind expressions and his very full treatment of the subject, must have contemplated some reply to the views which he has advanced, and in which we certainly did not concur, and I say this with due respect.

The President.—I thought you expected me to indicate to some extent what my views were on the subjects touched upon in your statement.

Mr. Downing.—We are very happy indeed to have heard them.

Mr. Douglass.—If the President will allow me, I would like to say one or two words in reply.

The President.—All I have done is simply to indicate what my views are, as I supposed you expected me to do from your address.

Mr. Douglass.—My own impression is that the very thing your Excellency would avoid in the Southern States can only be avoided by the very measure that we propose; and I would state to my brother delegates that because I perceive the President has taken strong ground in favor of a given policy, and distrusting my own ability to remove any of those impressions which he has expressed, I thought we had better end the interview with the expression of thanks. (Addressing the President)—But if your Excellency will be pleased to hear, I would like to say a word or two in regard to that one matter of the enfranchisement of the blacks as a means of preventing the very thing which your Excellency seems to apprehend—that is, a conflict of races.

The President.—I repeat, I merely wanted to indicate my views in reply to your address, and not to enter into any general controversy, as I could not well do so under the circumstances. Your statement was a very frank one, and I thought it was due to you to meet it in the same spirit.

Mr. Douglass.—Thank you, sir.

The President.—I think you will find, so far as the South is concerned, that, if you will all inculcate this idea in connection with the one you urge, *the colored people can live and advance in civilization to better advantage elsewhere than crowded together in the South*; it would be better for them.

Mr. Douglass.—But the masters have the making of the laws, and we cannot get away from the plantations.

The President.—What prevents you?

Mr. Douglass.—We have not the simple right of locomotion through the Southern States.

The President.—If the master now controls the freedman, would he not control his vote?

Mr. Douglass.—Let the negro once understand that he has an organic right to vote, and he will raise up a party in the South among the poor who will rally with him. There is this conflict that you speak of between the wealthy slaveholder and the poor man.

The President.—You touch right upon the point there. There is this conflict, and hence *I suggest emigration if he cannot get employment in the South. He has it in his power to go where he can get it.*

In parting the President said that they were both desirous of accomplishing the same ends, but proposed to do so by following different roads.

Mr. Douglass, on turning to leave, remarked to his fellow delegates: The President sends us to the people, and we will have to go and get the people right.

The President.—Yes, sir, I have great faith in the people. I believe that they will do what is just, and have no doubt that they will settle this question right, and hope that it will be submitted to them for final action.

The delegates then bowed and withdrew.

The country has been deluded with dreams and lying divinations about wondrous progress made in moral sentiment among rulers and people. How he Preside nt bounds onward is easily shown. This interview in the White House reveals it. His address to the colored troops outside, several months ago, was equally luminous. He forgot, in his ill manners, even to thank those noble braves, or to compliment them for what they had dared and done for his "white man's government." He rather rudely told them to go home and go to work and control their passions. Liberty, even in a land that had drank their blood, was not citizenship, suffrage, equality, fraternity, but the right to work and get the pay for it. Colonization or banishment was not absolutely threatened then and there, but the battle-scarred veterans were told that the nation they had so long enriched by their toil, and now saved by their blood and bravery, was "*experimenting*" whether it could live with them in it, unless it returned them to slavery, out of which God had delivered them by the flaming thunderbolts of war. "Let us," he added, "make the experiment in good faith!"

It is a singular circumstance that the President should have had interviews, in both these instances, with important white delegations from rebel States, almost on the same days when he met the representatives of the proscribed race. And those surely read to little purpose who fail to compare and observe the Presidential manner and aspect towards the two classes. And the Presidential progress towards a more just and righteous policy may be here also shown. His addresses to the two white delegations are in strange contrast with those to the representatives of the proscribed race. While the loyalty of the latter was and is above all suspicion, the disloyalty and treason of the other were far beyond all question. So he believed last April; and what was their true desert, he himself had declared not only then, but years before. Take some of his declarations relative to those who had lifted hostile hands against the Government. A few brief quotations will suffice.

In his reply to Senator Lane, March 2, 1861, Andrew Johnson said:

"Show me the man who has been engaged in these conspiracies, and I will show you a traitor. * * That being done, were I the President, I would have them arrested and tried for treason, and, if convicted, by the Eternal God, they should suffer the penalty of the law at the hands of the executioner."

On the 3d of April last, he declared—

"Treason is the highest crime known in the catalogue of crimes, and for him that is guilty of it I would say death is too easy a punishment.

Now for the "*progress.*" What he said to the colored troops we remember. What he said to a numerous deputation almost on the same day, representing nine rebel States, was in the style of the periods following, extracted from an address of half an hour. All he said or seemed to know of the negro was as unfeeling as though he had been speaking of any four-footed beast:

* * * * * * *

"The former status of the negro had to be changed, and we, as wise men, must recognize so patent a fact and adapt ourselves to circumstances, as they surround us. (Voices—We are willing to do so.) I believe you are. I believe when your faith is pledged, when your consent has been given, as I have already said, I believe IT WILL BE MAINTAINED IN GOOD FAITH, AND EVERY PLEDGE OR PROMISE FULLY CARRIED OUT. (Cries—It will.)

* * * * * * *

"Yes, the issue was made by the South against the Government, and the Government has triumphed; and the South, TRUE TO HER ANCIENT INSTINCTS OF FRANKNESS AND MANLY HONOR, comes forth and expresses her willingness to abide the result of the decision IN GOOD FAITH."

Poor *watch dog* Wirz was at that very moment on trial at the other end of the street, and was soon after hung!

Three days after the interview with the colored deputation, a commission came from the Legislature of Virginia, bearing a series of insolent resolutions adopted by that body (given to our readers two weeks ago). The same Legislature, at its session last Summer, refused to legalize the marriage institution among the colored population of that State. Below are a few excerpts of the address to those "*intelligent, responsible and respectable men of Virginia:*"

"As a premise to what I may say, permit me first to tender you my thanks for this visit, and next to express the gratification I feel in meeting so many intelligent, responsible and respectable men of Virginia.

* * * * * * *

"The preservation of the Union has been, from my entrance into public life, one of my cardinal tenets. At the very incipiency of this rebellion I set my face against the destruction of the Union of the States. The security afid protection of the rights of all the people are to be found in the Union. I stood, as I stand now, contending for the Union, and asserating the best and surest way to obtain our rights and to protect our interests was to remain in the Union. It has been most conclusively demonstrated that this Union cannot be dissolved, that it was not designed to be dissolved. It is exceedingly gratifying to me to meet you to-day, standing upon common ground, rallying around the Constitution and the Union of these States.

"I will only say, in conclusion, that I hope all the people of this country, in good faith and in the fulness of their hearts, will, upon the principles which you have enunciated here to-day of the maintenance of the Constitution and the preservation of the Union, lay aside every other feeling for the good of our common country, and, with uplifted faces to Heaven, SWEAR BY OUR GOD AND UPON OUR ALTARS THAT ALL ELSE SHALL SINK IN THE DUST TOGETHER RATHER THAN THIS GLORIOUS UNION SHALL NOT BE PRESERVED. (Great applause.) I trust we shall go on, determined to preserve the Union *in its original purity* against all opposers.

"It now I can only arrive at a point at which these States are all restored, each having its representatives in the national councils, with the Union restored, it will be to me a happy day."

And there is plenty more of the same sort, with nothing better.

It is easy to believe here that he declared last Spring, as his speech was reported, that "he was willing to cut Africa loose from Asia, and sink the whole black race ten thousand fathoms deep to save the Union!"

But no word had he on the one great problem (too great, alas, for him!) on which the whole safety and salvation of the Union must depend.

The Union and the Constitution are the broadest outlook his vision knows—as though the liberty of one man were not more than all human constitutions, and justice, than all the Unions in the Universe; even justice to that one lowly despised race in whose behalf the whole national calamity came, shivering to pieces the proudest Government on the globe.

Mr. Lincoln, too, would have saved the Union. He determined to save it if possible without emancipating a single slave, even at a sacrifice of blood and treasure unknown to modern warfare. But a greater than Lincoln directed otherwise. Almost a million human lives were paid (on both sides) for only a Proclamation of Emanciption from the chain of chattelism. And the outward condition of the slave was even then, in numberless instances, worse than before, if possible. And now if the Union can be restored "*in its original purity,*" without suffrage extended even to the colored citizens of Washington, the President assures the country it will be to him "*a happy day,*" and the very summit of his ambition and his hopes.

And this is he whom all the public gatherings of the people have been lauding as a god, without distinction of party. The press, too, with few exceptions, peals forth his praise. And so what can the pulpit do, with almost the whole sacramental host, but join to swell the general chorus? And this week unrolls another scene in the panoramma of Presidential progress. The party that elected him to the place from which a mysterious providence elevated him to his present position, has now another test of both his fidelity to them and to justice, as they profess to understand it. Almost unanimously they enacted a Freedmen's Bureau statute, made indispensably necessary by the monstrous and numberless outrages to which that unfortunate people are still subject at the hands of their former oppressors. Never, surely, was such protection or some protection of the kind, more needed. Never, perhaps, was a decree passed with greater unanimity. It is hurried up to the Executive table for approval. But it goes back again shrouded in the funeral pall of veto power.

Will the constancy of the Republican party still remain unshaken under this new affront added to the many they have borne before? Or will they now say as has ever been apparent to everybody else "he is joined to his idols, let him alone." To the South, to the Democratic party, to negro hate if not to slavery, he has sworn unalterable allegiance and firmly and faithfully he keeps the oath. Republicanism in an evil hour, adopted him. A Southerner, a poor white, a slaveholder, and a Democrat of the slaveholding school, the Republican party placed him where he must now hold the helm of the ship of State in the wildest Euroclydon that ever swept the ocean. There seems neither vigor to impeach him, nor virtue to resist his power. And so as the ancients bound the corpse of the murdered man face to face with the murderer and allowed it to corrupt and waste away, so the Republican party self-doomed, has borne a similar burden, long after it has become an offence and loathing to all mortal organs. And the burden and the bearer might consume together with small loss, it is to be feared, to the interests of humanity.

Meanwhile the wail of the Hebrew Minstrel seems wholly and literally a prophecy and a portrait of the forlorn black man as he stands before us to-day:

"He hath no form nor comliness. When we see him, there is no beauty, that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men—a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him *smitten of God* and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed," if indeed we can be healed at all.

THE VETO.—AN ASTONISHED SENATE.

WHAT almost everybody, not a Republican, has long confidently expected, predicted, and in some shape provided for (or against), as far as possible, seems to have struck our innocent and unsuspecting Senators with complete astonishment. The Lower House, too, appears to share the bewildering surprise, Mr. Speaker Colfax actually having risked and lost in a wager, a box of Habanas on the result. An eloquent writer in the *Times* would tell the world (if he could), how the stricken down Senators came together the next morning after the shock which had so nearly paralyzed them.

He says: "It was easy to see, as the Senators came in, that their minds were full of the important business to come before them. There was nothing of the *nonchalance* that usually prevails; every face wore some shade of anxiety, and some of them did not disguise the expression of antagonism, of preparation for war to the knife."

He continues: "The first demonstration, bearing upon the yet unannounced veto, was by Mr. Wade, who, during the morning hour, offered a joint resolution to amend the Constitution so as to prevent any man from holding the office of President of the United States for more than one term. The Ohio Senator improved the occasion." Mr. Wade said: "I have no doubt that the present Chief Magistrate came into office, as President, while he was perfectly single in his mind, sincere and truthful in his opinions. What were some of these opinions? Why, sir, he spoke, and reiterated it every day for two months, that treason was a great crime, that it ought to be punished, that it must be rendered odious, and that he was the man to do this. He said it to every delegation that waited on him until the words became stereotyped on the minds of the whole people. How, sir, has he performed that pledge? Has he punished anybody? Why, sir, we have the unheard-of spectacle of one of the greatest rebellions that ever cursed mankind, involving more people, more lives, more expense than all the rebellions that have occurred in history; and yet, sir, no man has been punished in consequence of it! Something is wrong. If this is all right then the whole system of Penitentiaries throughout the Union ought to be abolished. Sir, the President was right when he said that treason was a great crime and ought to be rendered odious. Why did he not carry out this declaration? What has occurred to change his position on this question? How does the policy that is now devolved upon us differ from that policy that would be announced from the same place by Jefferson Davis?"

But Mr. Wade speaks too late. He and his party have known and excused their chief too long and too well to be very sincere in their loud shrieks of surprise at this new but well-predicted apocalypse. It cannot be that any new discovery has been made. We must now wait and see what comes of it.

WORK NOT QUITE DONE.—A dispatch from Washington, on Tuesday, said: "An application by a lecture association for our largest hall in which to listen to a lecture from Wm. Lloyd Garrison, was met by a decided refusal, unless the Association would guarantee that no negro should be admitted. The managers of the Association replied that the tickets would be for sale publicly, and it would be impossible to hinder any one from buying a ticket that desired to go; but they offered to give a bond with ample sureties that the hall should be returned in as good condition as when it was taken. The offer was refused, and no hall could be had." Evidently some little jobs remain to be done yet.

The same writer farther tells us that "it has now come to light that the instructions under which the Freedmen's Bureau in Louisiana was so completely disrupted in November, and its 300 schools brought to a close, the freedmen and discharged colored soldiers arrested as vagrants in the streets of New Orleans, without trial or process of law, and *the orphans of freedmen returned to former slaveholders as apprentices, were imparted by the President himself;* and that Gen. Fullerton acted in accordance with Executive instructions." Many well-informed persons knew this before.

A CONFESSION.—Col. Forney writing from Washington to the Philadelphia *Press* says:

"Although there is a two-thirds vote in each of the two Houses of Congress in favor of the most earnest and thorough national policy, it may be said there is not a Republican or Union member of either branch who is not sincerely solicitous of acting in hearty sympathy with the President. Meeting many of these gentlemen daily, and conferring with them freely, I write these words confidently."

The country will possibly wish to know at sometime why, with such a majority against a President whose every act shows him the most dangerous man who ever sat in the Presidental chair, something is not getting done for the establishment of justice and the security of the blessings of liberty, in an hour dark with impending peril to every truly national interest. The letter closes with these words, which this "two-thirds majority" party is in danger very soon of disproving by its own culpable inaction:

"There could be no calamity so dreadful as that of allowing the Opposition party to resume the fatal ascendancy in the public counsels, which provoked and precipitated the recent civil war."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Several valuable communications are postponed by press of matter. It is hoped another week may open way for them.

THE VETO AND ITS VICTIMS.—The Senate voted on Tuesday on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill; the question being: "Shall this bill pass, notwithstanding the President's objection?"

YEAS—Messrs. Anthony, Brown, Chandler, Clark, Conness, Cragin, Cresswell, Fessenden, Foster, Grimes, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Howe, Kirkwood, Lane of Indiana, Lane of Kansas, Morrill, Nye, Poland, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Sumner, Trumbull, Wade, Williams, Wilson, Yates.—30.

NAYS—Messrs. *Buckalew*, Cowan, *Davis*, Dixon, Doolittle, *Guthrie, Hendricks, Johnson, McDougall*, Morgan, *Nesmith*, Norton, *Riddle, Saulsbury*, Stewart, *Stockton*, Van Winkle, Willey.—18.

Two-thirds did not say YEA, and the bill sleeps to wake no more.

THE VETO AND THE CABINET.—The *Herald's* Washington correspondent says: "The President decided at a late hour last night to call a Cabinet meeting for this morning to submit to the members his veto of the Freedmen's Bureau bill. They assembled about eleven o'clock, and were in session over an hour. Secretary Stanton left about half an hour in advance of the others. Secretary Seward was very positive in his endorsement of the veto. Secretaries McCulloch, Welles and Denison also approved the document, while Secretaries Stanton, Harlan and Speed opposed it. Stanton and Harlan were very decided in their opposition." The writer adds that Sir Edward Bruce was in the Senate during the reading of the Veto Message, and that Wm. Lloyd Garrison was a nervous spectator in the gallery.

BAD DISCRIMINATION.—The *Times* says:

In a message transmitted to the South Carolina Legislature recently, Gov. Orr used this language:

"So long as the African was a slave, though his moral training was not neglected it was our policy to prohibit him from learning to read and write. Now it is our policy to enlighten and elevate him, for it makes him more trustworthy, and reduces crime and poverty in our midst."

The *Times* adds: The doctrine enunciated in these sentences is not particularly new in the North; but it is a decided novelty in the South.

It is equally a "novelty" at the North that we "enlighten and elevate" men merely "to make them more trustworty and less criminal." But from Bishop Simpson, President of the Freedmen's Educational Commission downward, nobody yet seems to suppose education of the Freedmen has reference to anything belonging to themselves as responsible human beings, but only as they can be made more serviceable and less troublesome, as serfs, if not slaves, under "a white man's government."

BRITISH PERIODICALS.—Attention of readers is called to the prospectus of Messrs. Leonard Scott & Co. in another column. Press of matter this week prevents more extended notice of their favorable proposals.

PERSONAL.

The Right Rev. John Bernard Fitzpatrick, the Catholic Bishop of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, died at his residence on Washington street, in Boston, last Tuesday morning. He had been suffering from a painful and lingering illness for upwards of a year.

Lucy Cooper, a colored woman 110 years old, died at Nantucket a few days ago. She was brought from Africa to South Carolina and worked as a field hand until 1811 when she was brought to Newport, R. I. She ran away from her master at Newport on account of ill treatment, and has since lived at Nantucket.

Rev. Dr. Bacon, writing to the *Independent*, asks of the hero and martyr, John Brown, aside from his manifest insanity, what good reason was there why he should not be punished? The end at which he aimed could not justify the means which he employed—the levying of war against a recognized and established government. The blood which he shed unlawfully, and, *had he not been manifestly beside himself*, would have stained him with the guilt of murder.

The Roxbury (Mass.) *Journal* calls the refusal of the President to hold discussion with Frederick Douglass "*a case of shrewdness*" and says: "It was eminently discreet in the President to discountenance argument on the part of Fred. Douglass in their interview last week. Douglass would have floored him in reasoning from such premises as he laid down in five minutes, and the spectacle would not have been one that the nation could witness with pride, even if it had in it edification."

The Springfield *Republican* says: A member from Pennsylvania got off a good joke on the Bancroft oration. Some one asked him how he liked it. "Very well," was his reply, "only there wasn't very much of Lincoln in it; it was good history—what there was of eulogy was good. But I didn't like the receipt for his lodging and board at the close!" "What do you mean by that?" "Why, Bancroft, in closing, lugged in a paragraph approving of the President's Reconstruction policy, and it is so out of place that I suppose it was done to pay the President for his lodging and board while here, and as it saves him from going to Willard's I don't know as anybody can blame him!"

Parson Brownlow, referring to the loyalty of certain districts of Tennessee, says: "If Jesus Christ came down from Heaven to-morrow, with any number of glittering stars on his shoulder-straps, and the twelve apostles for his staff, they would all, bag and baggage, be expelled by the rebels of Davidson county." And yet the Evening *Post* can say of admitting their Representatives to Congress: "Every hour that leaves them 'out in the cold,' deepens and intensifies the shame and reproach of their inhospitable rejection. The rebellion cost Tennessee more, in suffering and sacrifices, than any free State was called to endure. Most of her citizens were loyal from the beginning, and through all the persecutions, houndings, burnings and hangings of the rebellion. Her representatives are true and loyal men. And yet they keep knocking in vain at the doors of Congress. Why not at once, in a spirit worthy of an enlightened and patriotic people, put out the 'latch-string.'"

The Chicago *Republican*, in an article on the speech of the President to the colored delegation, says:

"A very curious historical fact was hinted at by Mr. Johnson. It is, that he was invited by the leaders of the rebellion to become their chief. As he expressed it, he perilled in the war his life, liberty and property, 'when I had every inducement held out to me to take the other course, by which I would have accomplished, perhaps, all that the most ambitious could have desired.' Can this mean anything else than that the place occupied by Jefferson Davis was first offered to Andrew Johnson? What other place beside that of Davis could have opened such attractions to ambition? And does Mr. Johnson wish us to understand that if he had had the management of the rebellion it might have resulted very differently?"

RIGHTEOUSNESS EXALTETH A NATION.

THE moral idea with which Jesus of Nazareth startled the world, and sealed by his death, and which inspired men have pressed on the conscience of this nation and twice baptized in blood, is the "equal rights of all."

Despots, Monarchs, Emperors, Czars, Kings, and Presidents have, in every form of government, tried to circumvent this law, but failure is stamped on all their vain experiments.

In the panorama of the past, proud nations have risen, bright and glorious, but to set in clouds and darkness; and all that are yet to come, not based on the inexorable law of equality, must join the innumerable caravan that have gone before to sure decline, to death, to dust.

And yet, these mighty dead now resting in the tomb of man, have had their seers and prophets all along warning them against princes, popes, thrones, altars, codes and creeds, as worthless dross compared with godlike man.

But, flushed with power, hardened with ambition, enervated with luxury, or maddened with oppression, all alike have defied the law of justice, crucified their prophets, stoned their apostles, outraged the teachings of conscience, and with their own hands sealed their doom.

And now to us on this Western Continent an opportunity is given once more to found a nation where man may stand supreme, his hand on the throne of God, and beneath his feet all passion, wealth and power.

We have our faithful editors, divine poets, eloquent orators, wise Senators, our watchmen on the towers, all pointing to the straight and narrow path of safety, and to the dangers that lie on either side.

Shall we heed their warning, and with a high moral resolution worthy those who believe in judgment and a world to come, swear this day, that for us and ours, we will do justice, love mercey, and walk humbly before the Lord?

If so, ours the glory to roll back the mountains of oppression from the mouth of the sepulchre where so many human hopes are now entombed, that the sunlight of civilization may stream in and warm the dead and dying into life.

Ours the duty to lift up the humblest man for whom Jesus died, for the nation's love and worship, that with tears of penitence we may wash his bleeding hands and feet, and in the crown of thorns behold the halo of glory round his head.

There is no royal road to equality, "no purple and fine linen" for those who love their neighbors as themselves.

To build a true republic, is but to incorporate the grand idea of the Christian religion into our civil, political and social life.

This demands the sacrifice of class and caste, of power and place.

We have talked of a republic in this country, described it, defined it, eulogized it, but never had it; and how many men and women are now ready to begin a work like this? It is easy to pray, "Thy kingdom come," but who is ready for the sacrifice the answer to that prayer would bring.

To be cast out of Church and State, hounded by the press, and rent by those he would serve, has been and is the fate of every prophet who has dared to rebuke the sins of his day and generation.

Let us halt no longer between two opinions, lest we perish.

With the lessons of history, the obligations of religion, the rights of man on one side, let us not pause to weigh in the balance effete constitutions, a shattered Union, and a demoralized political party, whose rottenness its own leaders dare not unveil.

Our safety now is not in the manœuvres of party, but in appeals to the broad popular conscience; in the virtue and education of the people, and not in the tricks of their leaders.

Let our great historians and eloquent orators, regardless of a sneering press, go to the sovereign people and tell them all they have a right to know of what false rulers mean to do at home and cowardly diplomats have permitted to be done abroad.

If, in portraying the hateful principle of aristocracy and the glory of republican ideas, a Bancroft may chance to tread on the English Lion's paw, or a Phillips let fly an arrow at some time-serving priest or editor, what matters it so that the nation lose its faith in kings and rulers and learn to judge all measures for themselves. Let the press and people weigh well the *words* of men like these and leave their manners to be discussed by carpet knights and silly girls.

CORRECTION.—*Mr. Editor:* Lest your readers may think—from THE STANDARD of last week—that Frederick Douglass transcended the limits of his rights in entering a Northern "Institute" when as a boy he came among us, I would suggest that your printer's devil should have sent him to a Northern *latitude*, instead of an Institution to which one of his color had no access.

E. C. S.

SPEECH

OF

WENDELL PHILLIPS, ESQ.,

AT THE BROOKLYN ACADEMY OF MUSIC,

Tuesday Evening, Feb. 13, 1866.

[We give below a condensed but commendably fair report of the Address of Mr. Phillips last week before the Brooklyn Fraternity Association. It is humiliating to confess that we are indebted to the New York *World* for it, in whose behalf we bespeak the thanks of our readers. No other paper in the city deemed it worthy a place in its columns; Republicanism being very busy just now in other directions.]

MR. WENDELL PHILLIPS spoke last evening at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, under the auspices of a Republican organization, and was listened to by a very large and enthusiastic audience of ladies and gentlemen. The stage was occupied by a large number of the leading Republicans of Brooklyn.

Mr. Phillips was introduced to the audience by the President of the association, Mr. Aaron M. Powell. He announced that although Mr. Beecher's recent utterances on political topics had excited the surprise of his friends and admirers, that gentleman had been invited to speak at the Academy before the association on Tuesday evening of next week. He then introduced Mr. Phillips as Massachusetts Senator to the people at large—one who says what he means without whitewashing and without qualification, and whose words were always earnest and eloquent.

MR. PHILLIPS'S SPEECH.

Mr. PHILLIPS was received with loud applause. He commenced by remarking on the power and influence of the lecture system as inaugurated by New England, and as the most effective agent of spreading true views of national affairs. He continued: Now it is, standing on the platform of such a system, and with such a history behind it, that I feel I am not trespassing on the nature and function of that great system, as a part of which I speak, when I ask you to give the hour you lend me to the consideration of a civil duty; to the analysis and the study of public affairs; to the criticism of those men whose mistakes and whose statesmanship are to be the rod of our future. No matter how much we may differ, here is the place to compare opinions; here, in an especial sense, is the place to initiate a correct public opinion. Now, ladies and gentlemen, the hour in which we meet, the phase of national existence through which we are now passing, dictate still more emphatically the subject on which every earnest man should speak. We have been through the war; we have tried the force and the courage of democratic institutions; we have solved one great problem which troubled the world's peace, and that is, whether republican institutions can fight; whether the loose-jointed, unprepared, illy-compacted republican machinery, as the world deemed it, can survive the crisis of great civil convulsion. Statesmanship said hitherto, in such a storm, nothing but the firm sceptre of aristocratic or despotic rule can survive; and when the London *Times*, listening across the water, heard that signal gun at Sumter, it spoke the voice of all Europe when it cried out exultingly, "The bubble is burst!" But Europe watched a couple of years, and she saw the bursted bubble put a million of men into the field; she saw it crush this most gigantic of all rebellions more thoroughly than the most despotic prince could have done it; and Europe begins to believe that democracy can fight. And now comes the other, the second, the most momentous test, and that is, whether democracy is as competent to govern as to fight. You know that most illustrious of all historical annalists, that profoundest of all statesmen, Tocqueville, said when he spoke of the French revolution: "It was not because twenty-five millions of men were starved that the French nobility went down in '91; it was not because they were discontented and blood-thirsty; it was because the nobility did not know how to govern." They had not the brains to lead the nation at whose head God had placed them. Now these six months, it seems to me, God subjects us to just that test—whether these democratic and loyal Northern States have brains as good as they have proved their courageous right hands to be. Let me tell you why I think so. What has it been which has tried the nation for four years. A contest between two ideas. The South disbelieved in common schools—it believed with the Englishman, that one man is born booted and spurred, and another saddled and bridled ready for the first one to ride. It was to save such a civilization that the Southern States withdrew from the contingencies of free speech, free printing, free labor, and free institutions.

THE SOUTH RAGED TO SECEDE IN 1831.

They submitted the question to the ordeal of battle, whether democracy or aristocracy should have the rule of this continent. They tried to do it before. They attempted to put that question on the surface of the flood of events forty years ago. They tried it when South Carolina was so restless under the iron hand of Andrew Jackson. They would fain then have saved their institution. They would have saved that form of civilization which was hidden under the alien form of law. As Mr. Spratt said, in 1860, the secret of American troubles is two forms of civilization hidden under one law. The South knew it. She felt it in 1830. She would then have withdrawn her system from the danger, but Andrew Jackson kept her in the traces; kept her by that same form of compromise which, like the devil in Milton's legend, is now whispering its guile into the ear of the American public. Men said then, "What a deliverance!" They raised both hands and hurrased for the fame of the great Kentuckian that had kept the thin ice of an apparent union unbroken. They thanked God and said, "We have tided over the difficulty, we have driven the devil out of the possessed, and henceforth the country is safe." Oh, it was a magnificent chance, it was a superb opportunity; but the country was not educated up to the point of feeling, proper for it. We look back upon it now as men look back upon 1848, upon that unbroken wave of democracy that rolled from the Bay of Biscay to Russia, and over whose surface the right hand of Lamartine was stretched out with such supreme sovereignty, and when it seemed as if the millennium of the Declaration of Independence had come, and Europe henceforth was to be the abode of equality and brotherhood. We look back upon it to-day, and we see what a magnificent chance, what a superb opportunity; but France had not the brains to use it. The last time I listened to the eloquent lips of Edward Everett, I had the unwonted pleasure once in a dozen years of applauding him to the echo. I heard those compromising and tender tones utter their last warning to the American people, in a note that startled his admirers, and comforted those who had been his enemies, when he said to four thousand men in Boston, "If Andrew Jackson had hung John C. Calhoun in 1831, there would have been no confederacy in 1861. Would to God that we may not make another mistake in this second trial of the Union." (Applause.)

Well, fellow-citizens, he has gone from us, and the Union stands just at the dividing of the roads, just at the question whether it shall imitate that unfortunate President of 1831, or whether, wiser by experience, it shall make now radical work and hew actually down to the line, no matter what chips fly in our faces. I was asking, What did the South go out to preserve? She went out to save just this form of civilization to which I adverted—a government of one cast, labor the exclusive drudgery of another, and that class kept ignorant in order that it might be contented, disfranchised in order that it might be the mere ballast of the ship of state. The Honorable Mr. Spratt said to the Convention at Montgomery in 1860, when he was asked to tell the world why the South seceded: "We secede because the North believes in equality before the law, and we don't; because we believe in a class kept ignorant that they may be contented, distranchised in order that they may be merely the ballast of the ship of state."

THE SOUTHERN LEADERS STILL POWERFUL.

Now it was to save that, that the South seceded. And how does she stand to-day? A thousand men made that rebellion. You and I could sit here to-night—we could count up the Davises, the Masons, the Slidells, the Wade Hamptons, the Johnstons; we could count up a thousand names, and we should agree that if God in His mercy had blotted them out of life in the Fall of 1860 there would have been no confederacy. You know it. Where are those thousand men to-day? Where are those thousand forces hidden in the active and plotting brains of those at least mistaken statesmen? A hundred of them are beyond the water, exiled; a hundred of them are in their graves; the rest walk this continent to-day, pardoned or unpardoned, holding office, wielding influence, holding their States as passively in their right hands as they ever did. South Carolina loves Wade Hampton more to-day than she did in 1860; she places herself more admiringly in the hands of that class of statesmen than she did five years ago. No statute of disfranchisement could prevent it. Statutes do not give influence—statutes cannot take it away. If the United States, in Washington, should pass an act and say that your Sewards, your Weeds, your Hamiltons (take historic names, if you differ about the present) should have no influence over the Empire State; that Sumner and Wilson and Adams and Elliot should have henceforth no weight in the old commonwealth from which I came, do you suppose it would make any difference? Do you suppose that, with their past life, their character behind them, Massachusetts would not be just as lovingly in their hands as it was before the statute was passed? These men exist. They have won the love, the confidence, and that sort of loyalty which grows out of common misfortune, and which doubles common love, and so they stand before the nation.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE.

Are they to come back into the counsels of the State? Are they to share the power of the government? Well, our President said once that traitors were to be punished. He has not banished a traitor. He never will. I, for one, do not ask him to. The hour has gone. Eight months of life such as we have been living, which is eight and eighty years of common national existence, have floated by since it was possible. When James I. sent Raleigh to the scaffold, it did not stir colder horror through a large part of the civilized world than in America would be stirred to-day, if, after an imprisonment of a dozen months, Jefferson Davis ware sent to the scaffold. The action of government has closed the door of the scaffold. To-day the practical question is—these men are to be counted into the politics of the future; and the great question which concerns us first is, therefore, In what mode do they come back? Are they fit, or are they unfit? Are they converted, or are they conquered? Have they laid down their swords, or their opinions? I know the advice—the eloquent, the apostolic advice. I know the tone to which you are accustomed, and justly, to attach so much weight and importance, in whose advice very properly you delight to confide so entirely. I know the tones that tell you—those of the great and eloquent pastor that makes your city a light set upon a hill. I know his advice to the American people—it is practically, substantially this:

The South never did understand republican institutions; she never was competent to administer a republican government; the very nature of the soil, out of which her intellect grew, rendered it impossible. To-day she is in no condition to learn the lesson—sullen with defeat, sore by misfortune, sulky in her home, isolated, she cannot be taught. What, then, would you naturally conclude would be the advice? She never knew how to govern and cannot be taught. Why, naturally, we should infer, "keep her out of it." But the advice that comes to us from the apostolic lips, the pastor of your Plymouth church, is: "Because she is unfit, admit her; because she can never learn, trust her." Now I am for conciliation. My magnanimity in its true sense, with all respect, is as broad as his. I know as well as he does that Jefferson Davis cannot be hung, won't be banished, and can't be converted. (Laughter.) I know there are men who can be converted. Hundreds of men at the South can be converted, and have been. But God don't change a generation in an hour. He don't uproot the prejudices of five millions of men by a battle. The great waves that change the opinions of nations have a sweep of some thirty years; they cover the breadth of what we call the generation. God removes mistaken ideas as he does generations, by death. And in this matter of reconstruction my theory is, you must take it for granted that substantially and in the mass the five millions of Southern white men will die as they have lived—haters of the North and of Northern Union. They cannot be banished; it would be idle to disfranchise them, for the ballot-box is only the vein of political power; the brains that stand behind it give it character and tone. The white men of Tennessee and South Carolina, the educated

whip him when you please, as much as you please, for what you please, to what extent you please, and as often as you please. Well, now wherever you find a system which puts the labor of one class into the hands of another, and makes the lash the symbol of the system, it is slavery—no matter for the words. The people at the South do not catch the Northern idea; they are not converted to it, and don't believe in it. But you say "it is a conquered body—no matter for their opinions. They tried to sustain them by battle and have lost. Why do you ask them for their opinions." Well, that's true; but still it is proper to ask them for their idea. Look at the sympathy still remaining even at the North for that idea. Suppose I carry you to the Boston Board of Trade; suppose I open their chambers, where is spoken the voice of the commerce and the trade of New England. You will find there a hundred merchants speaking by their foremost men, and they say to South Carolina: "We believe with you that a compulsory system of labor is needed—a stringent vagrant law that shall whip men to work." The lesson of this war properly read is, that civilization rests on motive. Boston merchants say, "It cannot rest on motive; there is a race among us that obliges us to go back to compulsion." Seven thousand men stand within the highways of Virginia, beggars, homeless, penniless, craving bread all the winter from the North. They are not so by their own disposition, or their own idleness. No. Abraham Lincoln gave them land, and for two years they got their own bread out of the soil on which they were born. The present President reversed the helm of the vessel, and gave the land back to rebels, and turned the loyal cultivator into the streets. The negroes at the South have shown no lack of disposition to work. I say, without fear of contradiction, that there has not been found an appreciable class of the black population who have refused to work on fair terms. I hold in my hand, however, testimony that Gen. Howard, the head of the Freedmen's Bureau, believes in the necessity of treating the colored people as minors, as children, making them work by compulsion. In other words, he does not believe that God made the negro perfect when he pronounced him so; that he is an adjunct to the white man—a sixth and superfluous finger that needs our brains to set it working.

THE PRESIDENT ON THE SAME SIDE AS GENERAL ROBERT E. LEE.

But you will say the President does not agree in this theory of the South and of Gen. Howard. The campaign of Virginia was fought against the rebel Lee. *The present campaign is fought against Andrew Johnson, who leads the hosts of the Confederacy.* (Applause.) The question has shifted from the camp into the forum; it has shifted from the cannon into ideas; and the momentous discrimination needed to-day is where the party lines run. Camps fight well when they are drawn up opposite each other; the difficulty is when they are mixed. The difficulty of the present moment is that men are confused as to where the lines run. I will tell you my idea. Grant headed the Northern host; Lee the Southern. Lee has been whipped, and the battle settled. *To-day Congress heads the Northern host, and Andrew Johnson the South.* (Loud and continued applause.) And until you awaken the North to stand behind Congress and enhearten and encourage it to recognize its own leadership and that of its enemy, the State is not safe for a moment. Congress had been many months looking to a party which said: "We believe in universal suffrage, in the rights of the negro, in his right to land and to justice; but, Mr. Johnson, don't dream for a moment that we ever will oppose you!" You know how the South ruled us for fifty years by simply saying, "I am willing to break." The President had up to the present, ruled Congress in the same way, but at last Congress had turned and said, "We are willing to break." Now comes our second trial. Does the President dare to bring to bear upon Congress the patronage of the Government? If he does, we shall see whether 1866 is to do what no year in the history of this country has ever done: show us a Congress that could stand erect against a President of its own party. A Whig Congress did once stand firm against a Democratic President, but never in the history of the Government was a Congress able to stand up against a President of its own party. That work has now to be accomplished, or the idea of the North is to be sacrificed for the time being.

Well, you may say I am indulging very free criticism on public men and public journals; but I recollect who brought us where we stand to-day. I recollect the Summer of 1864. We stand to-day, with white lips, whispering to each other, "Can we, dare we trust the White House?" Men hurry to the telegraph, they consult the bulletin, they ask anxiously of each other the last hour's news. What is it? Why it is the last phase of that to-day—they dare not give the name—of the plot. It is the last news of the camp, which, without a banner, it has come to regard as that of the enemy. Who brought us here? Who put that tenant into the White House? Who, when his name swelled up in the cerulean with his kindred President, who bade us shut our lips and put our hands upon them before we dared to criticize the idols of the republican government? Why it was the journals of New York, the formers of public opinion; and the only virtuous journals that exist to-day are those that are calling on the men they insulted for their free speech, begging them in God's name to stand by them and save them from their own President. So I feel quite free to indulge in very free criticism, as I did in 1864. You remember how, from Massachusetts to the Mississippi River, there was not a man allowed to say his soul was his own against Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson, the favorites of the public. The blind partisanship of the religious press, the cheap logic of the partisan press, and the shifting philosophy of the ever-changing moon of the *Tribune*—all were fixed in the great purpose to put that platform as the test of the American future; and woe to the man who doubted the virtue of the journals, and to the few scattered Radicals of their own party who attempted to save them from their mistake.

A NUDGE AT THE EVENING POST.

Take the *Evening Post*, which has been regarded as the most persistent, intelligent, and high-toned of American journals. The *Evening Post* says that Andy Johnson is an *Evening Post* Democrat; that he may be trusted, that he understands republican government; that the amendment once placed in the parchment in Washington, over the head of the negro, you may then safely give back that race into the custody of the white men of the South, and their former masters. The *Evening Post* strangles Sumner with one hand and the Radicals with the other, and cries, "Great is Andy Johnson and the government of white men." (Laughter.) Now, the *Evening Post* knows that over its head and mine, for the last seventy years, have been the guarantees of an unequivocal Constitution, asserting for us the right to speak our sentiments and read the Declaration of Independence in the streets of Charleston, and William C. Bryant knows that, with all that guarantee behind him, he never dreamed, in his most sanguine moments, that he or I could tread the streets of Charleston a week, or publish even his journal, and come home again. He has forty years of experience, and yet, with that experience behind him—you may give what name you please to the advice of a journal that knowingly advocates before the American people, after such a war, the putting back of four millions of blacks into the hands of their exasperated masters, who once despised them and now hate them. Wade Hampton despised the negro once—he was a slave. He hates him now, for he is the ally of the North. The *Evening Post* would put behind the negro that flaunting lie which never protected my rights, and give him back to the custody of his master. That is philosophy, that is logic, that is moderation; and anything outside of that is fanaticism.

AFTER PRESIDENT JOHNSON AGAIN.

Now, what is it that this President, at present checkmating government, wishes and believes. He believes, as he says he does, in a white man's government—in colonization. There is one merit about him—frankness. Since he was President he has never concealed his opinions. When he was Vice-President he said, "I would sink the continent of Africa and its whole race ten thousand fathoms deep to save the Union." To the colored soldiers of the District, when they stood in front of him by the portico of the White House, he used the word "experiment" once, and the world has been crying out all Summer, "The President is trying an experiment, he is only developing the South, he is only sending the cable to South Carolina to let her hang herself; he is only drawing aside the devil's robes that you may see him." But he sent his Secretary of State to Auburn to indorse his plan—"This is my plan, and the only plan." He said to the negroes, "We are trying an experiment." What is it? Why, it is the experiment whether you can live here; the experiment whether the black race and the white race can live on one continent together. He says it is a wonderful mystery of Providence. Goethe says whenever you would understand a man read between his lines; by which he means, notice the unconscious choice of the words, and you will learn his bias. Read the President's speech in this way and you will see that he don't believe that the negro can live here. He said to them: "We shall try the experiment; try it as well as we can, and if we don't succeed, we will try to find a good place for you." Well, now, there are 400,000 negroes in South Carolina, and 291,000 whites. Suppose, if the problem goes against them, why should not the 400,000 black men say to the 291,000 white men, "Where do you propose to go?" (Laughter and applause.) You know the old Scotch laird of whom Scott tells the story that he had a troublesome servant to whom he said, "Jock, I can't bear it any longer, you and I can't live in one house." "And where does your honor think of going to?" says Jock. (Laughter.) But the President does not hold that doctrine. He banishes the race. He does not believe in it. I should have suggested to him, if I had been one of the negroes, that it would have been more generous if he had mentioned the circumstance of this *experiment* before asking us to fight. He repeats the same thing in his answer to the colored delegation. He don't believe in the possibility of the black man's even living here, much less in his enjoying political equality. He believes that the black man is not capable of taking the status of political equality with the white race—in other words, he does not believe in the Northern idea. (Applause.) Now, these Southern men who have been whipped are to be invited back into Congress!

Mr. Beecher says a certain course is magnanimity. This is my magnanimity. The idea that fought the war and conquered in a war of ideas has the right to hold the exclusive possession of the government until the issues involved in the war are settled beyond contingency. (Loud and continued applause.) Two men have a dispute about a line on their farms; they quarrel; they go to law; one man summons Evarts and O'Conor and Brady, and pays them ten thousand dollars, and they spend three years before your courts, and finally a verdict is given that the line is here. What would be the result? Would not you suppose that the victorious party would call for a civil engineer and run his line? Is not that the end of it? That is my end, but the end of your pastor is, that having settled the question and recorded the verdict, he shall walk up to his rival, rub his hands, and say, "Come, now, let us both try to agree where this line shall be run." Well, what did you have the lawsuit for? Unless the war was a frolic and by-play—a mere masquerade; if the war was a reality, if it meant anything, if it was worth three thousand millions of dollars and three hundred thousands of lives, then it means that the idea which conquered in the war draws its line. (Cheers.) That is all I claim of the South. I know, as I said, that Davis cannot be hung, or banished, or converted, and I put him in one scale, and I put by his side Wade Hampton with his hate, and Gov. Aiken with his ignorance. (Laughter.) Gov. Aiken is a millionaire—the richest man in his State, educated by wealth, business and official career—by all the influences that make men intelligent, this Unionist and model Southerner, this man with his heart in the right place, though he could not find any way of expressing it till 1864, this man summons his blacks and says to them, "Now, let us cultivate the old acres on this plan: We will divide the results in halves; I will take one half—you the other, and out of your half come the expenses." But the black man, who is not capable of taking care of himself, nevertheless sees that this will leave him nothing, and refuses; but, he says, "We will hire your plantations at a fair rent." Then this man, educated in political economy, with this project of reconstruction in his hands, says, "If you don't agree to my terms by the Christmas holidays, I will turn every man of you out of the shanties into the street;" and a counsellor who stands beside him says: "Burn the shanties down; that will be the surest mode of eviction." Mr. Phillips here referred to the examples of Jamaica and Barbadoes, asserting that their history proved that the black man knows how to take care of himself. The North says to the South, "Be Barbadoes." The South answers, "I prefer to be Jamaica;" and Andy Johnson says "Amen.'

MASSACHUSETTS WRITING JOHNSON'S NAME SIDE BY SIDE WITH THOSE OF BURR AND ARNOLD.—THE PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE ACCEPTED.

After alluding to the recent speech of the President to the Virginia delegation, in which he threatened that having crushed one extreme party the Government would swing around and crush the other, Mr. Phillips continued: Having crushed South Carolina, now the President means to crush Massachusetts. *Well, we accept the war. If he succeeds he shall write his name higher than that of Burr or Arnold, for the treason which they attempted and failed in he carried; but we will write it side by side with them—the traitor that tried and failed—if we win.* (Loud and long-continued applause.) Why I say this is, because no man on this continent understands the merits of this question better than the great Tennessean. He had felt it in his own State, and seemed to have the lesson of the war profoundly learned until he became Vice-President. The voice of Brownlow saying: "If reconstruction means withdrawal of the army, don't reconstruct," was the voice of Johnson till he accepted the White House and the leadership of the Southern idea. But to-day he says to the War Secretary, "muster out the army," and the Secretary replies that 800,000 men have been mustered out, and only 20,000 regulars and 30,000 volunteers are left in service. The Radicals said to the President, "if you must reconstruct, reconstruct one State, or begin with a single function, so that the government newly entrusted to the hands of these Southern men, may be tried."

THE THREAT OF IMPEACHMENT.

But he reconstructed every element; he exhausted and transcended his own powers; he went to the verge and almost touched the limits where impeachment hung over him. He mustered out our army and called the Southern militia into existence, and then gave Congress Hobson's choice of taking his reconstruction or none. He then says practically to the country, "I don't believe in the Northern system of equality. The safety of the Union means to crush the principle in the North that rallied to the support of Abraham Lincoln, and to which he confessed that he owed the success of the war." Now my idea is, Congress stands to-day defiant; it looks back upon the journal system that does not support it, with a few exceptions—perhaps I could count them on the fingers of my hand—the journals of the North do not support the present attitude of Congress boldly and valiantly. On the contrary, they leave the cry of peace and the fear of disruption in party relations to frighten the public. This is not merely a negro question—it is one to you of the prosperity and permanence of the Government. We hated the Irishman as much as the whites hate the negro, but we gave him the ballot; and wealth looking upon him and seeing it was in his power, took care to put a school-house over his head; so to the negro the ballot means education and protection. But it is a different question to you. You own a share in a national bank, or a seven-thirty bond, and the refusal of the ballot to the negro means the payment of the Southern debt, or the repudiation of the Northern debt; our bonds will come back from Europe, and will become a drug in the market. The speaker went on to say that our Northern laborers will not emigrate into the South in this condition of things, which President Johnson desires to inaugurate. The men of the South were emigrating into Missouri and Iowa, distrustful of the security of their own homes. There never could be reconstruction with the flood flowing that way. Northern capital must be induced to go down South. The negro cannot get on alone. Negro ballot and negro land do not mean everything good. No platform, speaker, or Congressional Radical can make the Union clean and sound in a few days. It is a question yet whether the government will be saved. It is not certain that free institutions shall rule the country. Southern ideas are not yet extinguished. The other day, Henry Ward Beecher and his friend, Gov. Parsons, of Alabama, came to Faneuil Hall, Boston, and brought the most insolent message that ever came to that house. Gov. Parsons said to the Loyal League Club, substantially, "We don't believe in Massachusetts. You believe in free schools; we don't. You believe in free labor; we don't. You believe in a mechanic being your equal before the law; we don't. We want to put our heel upon Massachusetts isms. We say they are all bosh; we have reconstructed Alabama on a different plan, and should be obliged if you will loan us a million of dollars to complete the task." Mr. Beecher also made a speech and preferred the same request. Senator Sumner got on his feet. "Gov. Parsons," said he, "when a man asks bread of Massachusetts, it shall always be given freely. But when you ask a loan, it has two conditions. A man who lends his money to help an experiment must wish it success. Well, we don't wish success to your Alabama. Secondly: When a Yankee lends a million of dollars, he likes to get it back. We don't believe a million of dollars sent down to *your* Alabama will ever come back." "Well," says the Brooklyn apostle, "you want negroes to vote, then?" "Certainly," says Mr. Sumner. "But," said the apostle, "they don't vote in Connecticut." "Connecticut," said Mr. Sumner, "is a mean State." But Connecticut stands on her own bottom, with her Senators inside the Senate; Alabama stands on the threshold on her good behavior, and she ought not to come in until she reconstructs her Government on the basis of the laws of God. I am sorry to say that the prestige of apostolic eloquence carried forty votes, and political economy pronounced by Mr. Sumner carried only six. But next day, when they went down to State street to get the money, the merchants had none to lend. There was a pocket-nerve which sympathized with Mr. Sumner's prophecy that money sent to Alabama would never return. Our cotton speculators have agents in the South who say, "Don't send a man or a dollar here; you can't afford it."

Until the great question of capital and labor was settled—and it would only be settled justly—the South could never settle down into a harmonious basis of commercial and economical prosperity. New England and New York had tried the experiment of free institutions and had prospered with a marvelous prosperity. Let the South make a similar experiment, and the same result would follow. The war meant something: we fought for something. We fought for the great principle which South Carolina raised. We could not raise it. The Abolitionists wanted to raise it. You will testify how hard we tried to raise it. It was whether aristocracy or democracy should rule the continent. She raised it. She chose her time and the court before which to carry it, and lost the cause. She ought now to submit to the verdict, and allow the North to plant one foot on the Lakes and the other on the Gulf, and establish everywhere free and equal institutions.

Mr. Phillips appealed to the country to preserve the heritage which the heroism of the soldiers had won for it. He referred to the story of Sir Philip Sydney, but said he could match it with a thousand instances of nobler devotedness. I can take you, he said, to the roof of a soldier's widow whose boys went down to battle. They had months in that hell at Andersonville, where, in the midst of starvation and cold and suffering, the voice of the tempter came to them, and said, come out and enlist under the stars and bars, and here are liberty and food for you, and the boys refused. A fortnight later, in a greater strait, the same voice said: Here are food and comfort for you if you will come out and make shoes for us as you did in Massachusetts; and the pale lips, almost voiceless in death, whispered "The old flag forever!" I implore you not to cast away the victory which men such as these won for the idea of the nation—the idea of free labor. (Prolonged applause.)

MR. BANCROFT'S ORATION.

THE PRESIDENT AS AN EDITOR.

[The *Commonwealth* has a Washington letter containing the following:]

One of the most significant things said by Mr. Bancroft in his oration, and which was most rapturously received, was an allusion to Russian emancipation and the noble statesmanship of the Emperor in providing for the continued progress of the people by settlement of the late serfs upon freeholds of their own, and it brought round upon round of applause from floor and gallery alike. Again and again, for several minutes, were the echoes roused by hearty approval of this act. Gen. Butler could be seen acting as fugleman when this and similar principles were announced. All over the distinguished assembly, senators, representatives, generals, admirals and state officers could be seen showing their sympathy. I mention this because of the occasion and of the presence. No rebuke of the "race-hating" policy of Mr. Johnson could possibly be more weighty.

Mr. Bancroft's radicalisms were most heartily received. His graceful plea for Tennessee was but faintly responded to, while every word of Mr. Lincoln's bearing upon enfranchisement of the freed people was welcomed enthusiastically.

It is whispered that Mr. Bancroft (who was the President's guest) had hardly made warm his seat in the White House before he took occasion to take Mr. Johnson to task upon the policy indicated in his talks with the colored and Montana delegations. How much effect Mr. Bancroft's rebuke has had is seen in the still more malignant spirit displayed in Mr. Johnson's reply to the reconstructed Virginians on Saturday.

Among the most familiar and frequent habitues of the White House is Tom Florence, proprietor of the *Constitutional Union*. This copperhead has the private *entrée*. As he has been a most malicious opponent of the war, as he now is a denouncer of the loyal leaders in Congress, his familiar terms with the Executive have an importance beyond his own petty personality.

Mrs. Cobb has resumed her pardon-brokerage. She is a daily visitor at the executive mansion. This is a disreputable circumstance, which ought to meet a severe denunciation everywhere.

Coyle, editor of the *Intelligencer*, is daily seen in Mr. Johnson's reception-room. He passes in and out with perfect freedom, while representative men of the North are allowed to air their impatience in the ante-room. This, taken in connection with the bitter malevolence displayed in the editorial conduct of Coyle's journal, has an important bearing.

Col. Forney, Secretary of the Senate, according to usual etiquette, has free access to the President in his official capacity. A story has already circulated that the Colonel, a few days since, was refused admittance in his private character, but that shortly after, bearing a message from the Senate, he was ushered in and found the *Intelligencer* man and the President correcting proofs. On Thursday last, Col. Forney again carried a message, and, as usual, doors were thrown open, and in he walked. Again he found Mr. Johnson at his editorial labors, with his assistant, Mr. Coyle. The special value attached to this incident is the fact that, next day, the *Intelligencer* had a remarkable leader, denouncing the congressional majority as revolutionists, traitors, etc., and declaring the rebellion ended and "the Republic restored in whole and in every part," and the States as equal in rights, immunities and dignity.

Under the encouragement of the White House, colorphobia is reviving in Washington. For the proof, we have but to observe the insolent spirit of the street-car conductors to their passengers of that class. The unchecked incendiarism which of late has threatened the dwellings of colored people is another token. Still another is the frequent arrests and unjust damages by the municipal police and magistrates of unoffending colored men. But a most significant sign, and a most disgraceful one, is the setting apart in the Senate chamber of special seats for colored people. This spectacle is seen every day. Mr. Sumner called upon the doorkeeper for an explanation. He was informed that no effort was made to prevent colored persons sitting anywhere in the public galleries, but that, as a matter of convenience, they were directed to certain portions. But the explanation is not true. Colored persons *are* prohibited by the doorkeepers from entering certain portions of the gallery, and *are* directed to certain specified places. White persons who inadvertently start to enter that section are informed those are "the niggers' seats." Even in the House I observe an attempt to parcel out the gallery by complexional rules, though not to the same extent as the Senate's understrappers do.

A CURIOUS RELIC OF BARBARISM.—The Lexington (Ky.) *Observer and Reporter* contains an advertisement of a Commissioner's sale, to be held on the 5th of February, 1866, of which the following is a part:

"I will also, under said order, sell at the same time and place a Negro Man, named Will, or William.

[After naming the terms on which the land will be sold the master commissioner continues:] "The negro man Will, or William, will be sold on a credit of four months, the purchaser to execute bond with good security for the purchase price, payable to the commissioner, to bear interest from the day of sale, and to have the force and effect of judgments. W. J. STEELE,

"Master Commissioner Woodford C. C."

Bidders will be scarce at that sale.

TAXATION AND NO REPRESENTATION.—The Washington *Reconstructionist* says: Through the kindness of Gurden Snowden and Walker Lewis we have just had an opportunity to take a bird's-eye view of the Assessment Roll of the colored people of this District for 1862–63; and present the following as a few among many of a similar nature, showing the amount of property (real estate) owned by colored people and taxed for the support of schools, etc., from which they have been constantly secluded: Charles Brown $2,059; Anthony Bowen $2,874; Charles Bruce $1,922; Elizabeth Bradley 1,844; Elizabeth Brent $4,322; Charles Brooks $3,390; Geo. Bryant $3,162; Hanson Brooks $2,511; Harriet Cornish $3,377; John F. Cook $9,306; Sarah Cosley $2,088; Wm. Cook $3,303; Henry Douglas $4,900; Chas. Dyson $4,327; T. E. Boston $2,901; Theodore Brook $3,542; Wm. Brown $3,760; A. A. Cook $2,346; A. Gray $2,330; Alfred Jones $7,537; Jacob Jackson $4,400; H. Humphries $2,549; Henry Logan $3,334; Alfred Lee $15,551; Lindsay Muse $5,979; Walker Lewis $7,295; Flora Hicks $2,549; A. Hanson $6,166; M. Jackson $2,382; Mary Jones $2,480; B. M. McCoy $4,143; Matilda Madison $3,097; B. Newton $3,088; Samuel Proctor $2,346; Alex. Shaw $2,217; A. Summerville $2,616; Gurden Snowden $2,849; A. C. Lewis $2,327; L. Simms $2,625; Wm. Syphax $2,194; R. L. Saunders $2,002; L. Tanner $2,776; F. Beagle $1,986; Chas. Williams $2,185; H. Warren $2,633; J. Warren $1,944; Jas. Wormley $4,703; John West $5,293; Wm. Wormley $2,582; and Wm. Walker $16,504.

The agregate amount of taxable property owned by this class in this city for the year 1862–63 was $538,809, on which were collected for taxes $40,420. The probable amount assessed in 1865 for the colored people is one million dollars, which will be made to pay into the treasury a tax of one hundred thousand dollars. This is no small sum; and is, of itself alone, a voluminous commentary upon the industry and economy of those persons who are said to be "unable to take care of themselves and nearly all of whom have either been slaves or the descendants of 'human chattels.'"

THE FREEDMEN.

GEN. HOWARD of the Freedmen's Bureau gave a Lecture on Saturday evening last to a rather thin audience in Cooper Institute. From the report in the *Tribune* we extract the following:

Beginning our emancipation career at the close of a long and exasperated conflict, carried on against the accomplishment of that emancipation, we have given a new birth to freedom under the worst possible auspices. Lee's army surrendered, then Johnston's, then Kirby Smith's; the war is over, and suddenly all the chains of slavery are broken and between three and four millions of slaves are emancipated in the midst of a people full of resentment and prejudice. Hostile to liberty they raised large armies, fought with desperation; they are conquered, but they will not be brought in a day to love the thing they hated. They surrender slavery inch by inch and piece by piece, but they will not give it up altogether until constrained to do it by the power of freedom itself. *Compulsory* labor is stamped upon every plan yet proposed; their whole thought seems to be, "How can we white men maintain our authority over those *black men?* how keep them from renting land, from having disputes with us, and testifying against us in courts of law, and having a voice in framing and executing the laws?" The great majority of the Southern people avow all this; it is a truth apparent to every thinking man. On the other hand there is a large class at the North, brought up under influences, who reason in this way: "Slavery is a great crime, and therefore all slaveholders are conscious criminals. No kindness is shown that class; they are denominated 'fanatics,' and other opprobrious epithets, etc., Those who believe in this way are wrong. They are incrusted by prejudices quite as much as the Southern extremists. The question for us is, "WHAT IS THE TRUTH."

The truth is that the large body of the Southern men are sincere. Strange as it may seem, they disbelieve in freedom for the negro. They regard emancipation as a curse of God cast upon them. The Southerner regards his Northern brother as carried away by a delusion founded on ignorance of the negro character. There is another class of people quite different from that in the South who have been accustomed to reason and argue with us, but they are so overwhelmed by their losses, caused by the devastation of war, that they reflect very little on these things, and seem to have lost all energy and hope. There are also men of culture and refinement there who are now sanguine advocates of free labor. The newspapers keep harping on the question all the time. One of my assistants sent a communication to several Southern editors, a short time ago, saying, "Gentlemen, you do not allow me an opportunity to speak of the faults of the negro; you keep me all the time on the defensive," and since then they have ceased, in a great measure, their attacks.

But the great body of the emancipated will be purified and strengthened by the experience they are now passing through. Most of the colored people will work, lest they lack the ability so as to enjoy the fruits of their own labor. I never yet found a man that did not wish to be free. (Applause.) I asked them, "Why do you wish to be free?" and the invariable answer was, "I wish to enjoy the fruits of my own labor." (Applause.) There are thousands of poor women with families, without husbands, children without fathers, who have no one to care for them. In Virginia, where large numbers of children were reared for the slave-market, there is now naturally a large surplus, and you can have no idea how much they need, not food and clothing, but sympathy, kindness, encouragement and guidance. Our soldiers, as they marched along, told them that they were to have their masters' estates, houses, horses, mules, etc., until it became the universal belief among the freedmen that such would be the fact at the termination of the war. Their joy at seeing our army was unbounded. It seemed to be a very prevalent idea with our soldiers that all the white men in the South who had fought against or took part in the rebellion had thereby forfeited all their rights to property. Before we entered Savannnah the negroes, by some undercurrent, found out that the place was to be evacuated the next day. The Generals of our army knew nothing about it, but the colored people were acquainted with the fact, and held one of their peculiar festivals on the Anderson plantation, singing songs, rejoicing and praising God that their freedom had come to them. There was a reaction afterward, and I heard strong men cry out: "Is this Freedom? what! walks hundreds of miles for freedom and get nothing!" A great many refugees, white and black, followed our army. At one time there were 800 whites and 8,000 blacks. They were sent away from the army, and at one time it took three or four hours for a column of them to file past my quarters. I might bring before you many scenes that would oppress and harrass you, but if you have caught my meaning that there are disparities which are occasioned by bad dispositions of the negroes or bad qualities of the whites, it is sufficient. I mean disabilities growing out of the nature of the case. Now what do we propose? We have destroyed secession and rebellion (applause); we have broken the picture of State supremacy, and slavery, nominally at least, is dead. (Applause.) And what do we propose to do? If I understand it, it is to so regulate our public affairs as to secure to ourselves certain blessings; to all our people, black and white, certain inalienable rights contained in the old Declaration of Independence (applause), the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (Cheers.) Can we now solve that old problem in the midst of the difficulties that surround us? There are the white men of the South with their prejudices and predilections engendered by antecedent slavery on the one hand, and the emancipated, almost helpless, on the other. The Government stands forth with its gigantic resources as an intermediary agent between the two classes. At the close of the war I was placed at the head of what a great General has called a "Bureau of Impossibilities." (Laughter.) But I went to work to do what I could to solve, or help to solve, the problem. My thoughts centered on the actual state of things at the South; I could not forget all the feelings of hate at the South, the battle-fields, prisons, desolated homes and devastated farms, sacked cities and plundered villages; but particularly to be remembered were these crowds and crowds of negroes. My first decision was, labor must be settled—the first thing to attend to is the physical wants of the people, and if we would not have starvation that question must be settled immediately. It was very tempting to put a hand on the new freedman and compel him. It was very easy by military power to regulate matters in this way. Letters recommending that course poured in from the North, East and West. But it was necessary that the Blacks and Whites should remain together. It was necessary to show the property-holders and laborers that they had an identity of interest, and it was necessary to correct the false notions that had been industriously circulated among the freedmen. Some of our papers charge that the object of the Freedmen's Bureau is to support negroes in idleness. I emphatically deny it. (Applause.) It is not only not the object, but the object is diametrically the opposite (applause); and, if the work goes on in the future as it is now, my impression is that there will be no more need of any agency of the General Government in the South than in New York or Ohio. (Applause.) In Louisiana to-day property is changing hands, leases and titles to property are being granted, and it is an indisputable fact that the men coming there never worry themselves about social equality (applause), testimony in law-courts or negro suffrage; and what is true of Louisiana, as regards property, is true of almost every other State. In Mississippi the demand for laborers is greater than the supply; wages are $20 a month for able-bodied men, and in Arkansas they want from 3,000 to 4,000 more men than they have, to whom they will pay from $20 to $25 a month. Petersburg seems to have sprung up with a new life. The streets are full of wagons loaded, the stores are open, and trade is lively; so it is in many places. This cry about negroes not working first came from the South, and it is echoed here by editors and everybody else. The great majority of the negroes are at work, and in five years we shall be fairly on the road to material prosperity. Harmony between owners and laborers may be brought about in time without much progress. The military power can make it. I have said to Congress that education will go far toward it. This seems a plain proposition, and yet it is disputed. A general belief existed North, as well as South, not very long ago, that negroes could not learn. But there were a few "fanatics" at the North who would try the experiment, and the experiment has proved a complete success. (Applause.) They think the negroes were not intended by nature for education; that they will, if educated, be unfit for labor. The colored schools have sprung up as if by magic. I report 70,000 negro children at school in the Southern States, and my agents report many others that are self-sustaining.

We found six of those self-sustaining schools in Tallahassee, Florida. In Lynchburg I found a school taught by a colored man. I went there, being told that the negroes were in insurrection. They had raised 1,000 bushels of wheat, of which they were entitled to half, but the master had taken it all to pay expenses. They were greatly depressed, too, because the master said they would be $2,400 in debt at the end of the year. Whole regiments of them have learned to read, and I should not be surprised to hear that on every plantation at the South there are some of the people who know how to read. The question in Virginia is now who shall teach them. The Baptists are working in this matter, and doubtless the Methodists will not be behind hand. Education should, however, be placed there, as here, beyond the peradventure of failure. Some time will be needed, but the leaven is working. The influx of men who believe in education, and the negroes who so greatly need it, will doubtless secure the desired end. The industrial schools of the Quakers there are doing a great work. I like them. God bless the Quakers. Government will probably appropriate $3,000,000 for educational purposes. We must own lands, as the arsenal lands are owned, so that we can put up the old flag there and defend it. We have secured in the form of the contract these school privileges, and the men going South are secured in these privileges also. Much has been done for our soldiers, and I don't wonder at the reaction. But the work isn't done yet. I have seen thousands of white people as poor and miserable as they can be. I haven't wondered at the curses heaped by them on that freedom which, they believe, caused this suffering, but the fact is the suffering is the result of the war for slavery. I urge magnanimity toward the whole South. I haven't forgotten the 300,000 of our brothers who fell in the war, nor the sufferings of our naked prisoners who came from Andersonville, nor the tall form of our murdered President; but slavery has done all this, and thank God slavery has received her death-blow, and the wide world knows it is dead. Now, then may we not put away all malice and put on a broad charity, love to God and love to man? It is proposed to organize and conduct industrial farms in the country, and to set apart certain public lands for industrial settlements. Many grievous wrongs are perpetrated against the negroes in some of the Southern States, the old black code being still in vogue. [The General here narrated a long list of outrages.] There are men there, young bloods, who do these things, shooting black and white men without remonstrance of conscience—a set of men who, as Gen. Sherman used to say, would have to be killed before we really could have peace. On the whole, matters are by no means so bad as they are represented. (Applause.)

FOREIGN ITEMS.

FRANCE AND MEXICO.—The question of Mexican occupation by French troops seems not so near a quiet solution as has been supposed. The Paris journals actively discuss the Mexican question. The *Constitutionnel* defends the position of the French Government, and is evidently inspired by the Foreign Office. It seeks to dissipate disquiet in the public mind, under the publication of the correspondence with the United States.

The *Constitutionnel* says: "*The Imperial Government will never yield to intimidation;* and no excitement, whether it exists at home or abroad, will make the Emperor relax in his habitual solicitude for the moral and national interests in the country. *The troops from Mexico will return precisely on the conditions mentioned in the speech from the throne, namely, without endangering the French interests we have gone to defend in those distant countries.*" The *Constitutionnel* also expresses the belief that the Americans will conform to the law of non-intervention, and concludes as follows: "Finally, none of the dark forebodings by which public opinion is sought to be alarmed will be realized. *The peace of the world will not be disturbed; and we affirm boldly that the French interests in Mexico will incur no danger.*"

Le Nord states that M. de Traverney, who had left for the United States, is the bearer of dispatches of a very firm character, demanding categorically of the American Government whether it means to regard a protracted occupation of Mexico as a *casus belli*.

SPAIN and Chili, too, are coming daily nearer to serious work. The Spanish ministry have presented a bill to Congress subjecting the press and political associations to very stringent regulations.

Gen. Prim had arrived at Lisbon and was the guest of Marquis Nisca.

The London *Times* remarks that Spain tenaciously refused to accept the declaration of Congress of Paris in favor of abolishing privateering, and now that weapon is turned against her. A very short time will enable the Chilian government to commission such a fleet of privateers that Spanish commerce will be impossible, and even vessels of war will be in danger of being captured singly. The *Times* thinks another and more vigorous diplomatic effort should be made at mediation.

THE Liverpool *Post* of the 30th January, says: We understand that the Spanish consul at this port has received from his government instructions to expedite with all possible haste the orders now in hand for the construction of several steam iron-clads on the Mersey. There are, altogether, twelve of these war ships building in different parts of great Britain for the Spanish government, and similar orders have been sent to London and the other outports. Now that internal difficulties have been somewhat allayed by the disbanding of Prim's volunteers, these instructions have a rather peculiar significance. A surmise may be indulged that the speedy completion of the vessels may have some reference to the not over pleasant relation of Spain with other South American republics besides Chili.

THE "NEGRO PEW"—A HISTORICAL RELIC.—The allusion in Dr. Holland's poem the other evening to

"The negro pew where, outcast and alone,
With head low bowed, he worshipped at God's throne,"

has called to the mind of the writer the following relic of New England sentiment forty years ago, copied from a deed of a pew, in the Orthodox church at North Amherst, Mass., to a relative of his. It was customary in those days to raise money for building churches by selling the pews, and to raise money thereafter for the support of preaching by a parish tax. The pews in this particular church were sold under the following provisions, the deed, from which we copy, bearing date November, 1826.

"Provided, however, that if the said grantee, his heirs or assigns," etc., etc., "shall allow the said pew or pews to be painted, or suffer any alteration thereof to be made affecting its exterior appearance, without the permission of a majority of the proprietors of said house; or shall let the pew, or any part thereof, to any negro or mulatto, *or in any way admit any negro or mulatto* to the possession or occupancy of the same, then the said pew or pews, or such share thereof so let or occupied, shall in every case be forfeited and become the property of the other proprietors of said meeting house."

KENTUCKY LOYALTY.—On Wednesday last the Kentucky Senate adopted the House resolutions, requesting the removal of the troops from the State, condemning the Freedmen's Bureau, asking for the restoration of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and rejecting the Constitutional Amendment.

American Anti-Slavery Society.

Acknowledgments from January 1st to February 1st, 1866.

J. B. Arnold	$1 50	E. G. Lucas	$3 00
C. B. Allen	2 50	George Lamg	1 00
J. M. Aldrich	3 00	Lincoln Literary Soc'y	3 00
John G. Anthony	1 50	Sophia H. Little	3 00
Mrs. Robert Adams	1 50	Mrs. G. C. Lawrence	3 00
Sarah A. Allen	3 00	Simpson Lewis	3 00
Thomas Borton	3 00	James McGregor	4 50
William H. Burr	2 00	S. D. Moore	5 00
Mrs. Mary Bingham	1 50	Thomas S. Marriott	3 00
H. F. Bradley	2 00	F. McIntire	3 00
M. Bates	2 00	Samuel Mower	2 00
Thomas Brown	3 00	J. B. Marvin	3 00
L. Barnaby	1 50	C. D. B. Mills	3 00
Amos Brosius	1 50	George Miles	3 00
Amos Ballou	3 00	John Manly	3 00
Julia Barrett	1 50	John Mitchell	3 00
L. H. Bowker	3 00	George S. Mitchell	3 00
Margaret J. Burleigh	3 00	Lewis McLaughlin	3 00
E. S. Bunker	3 00	Charles E. Norton	1 75
James Clothier	1 00	Wm. P. Martin	3 00
J. Cortland	5 00	J. C. Nichols	3 00
T. Cushing	3 00	Anne M. Newhall	3 00
Rev. A. Cole	3 00	C. G. Olds	1 00
Martha Chapman	3 93	Hannah Ower	3 00
Dr. J. Church	3 00	Stacey Pickering	3 00
Enoch Clark	5 00	L. A. Parish	3 00
E. S. Coleman	3 00	R. M. Pratt	2 50
R. R. Crosby	3 00	Jacob Powell	3 00
Harris Campbell	1 00	J. E. Paine	2 00
Fred'k S. Cabot	3 00	Robert Purvis	3 00
H. W. Carter	3 00	Edith Peacock	3 00
Summer Cheney	3 00	Mary Pickering	3 00
Miss A. A. Chapman	6 00	Mrs. Joseph Plumb	1 50
R. P. Dean	3 00	L. S. Putnam

Miscellaneous Department.

HEROES.

BY EDNA DEAN PROCTOR.

The winds that once the Argo bore
  Have died by Neptune's ruined shrines,
And her hull is the drift of the deep sea-floor,
  Though shaped of Pelion's tallest pines.
You may seek her crew on every isle
  Fair in the foam or Ægean seas,
But out of their rest no charm can wile
  Jason and Orpheus, and Hercules.

And Priam's wail is heard no more
  By windy Ilion's sea-built walls;
Nor great Achilles stained with gore,
  Shouts "O ye Gods! 'tis Hector falls!"
On Ida's mount lies the shining snow,
  But Jove has gone from its brow away,
And red on the plain the poppies grow
  Where the Greek and the Trojan fought that day.

Mother Earth! are the Heroes dead?
  Do they thrill the soul of the years no more?
Are the gleaming snows and the poppies red
  All that is left of the brave of yore?
Are there none to fight as Theseus fought
  Far in the young world's misty dream?
Or to teach as the gray-haired Nestor taught?
  Mother Earth! are the heroes gone?

Gone? in a grander form they rise;
  Dead? We may clasp their hand in awe;
And catch the light of their clearer eyes
  And wreathe their brows with immortal flowers.
Wherever a noble deed is done
  'Tis the pulse of a Hero's heart is stirred;
Wherever right has a triumph won,
  Then are the Hero's voices heard.

Their armor rings on a fairer field
  Than the Greek and the Trojan fiercely trod;
For Freedom's sword is the blade they wield,
  And the light above is the smile of God.
So in his isle of calm delight
  Jason may sleep the years away;
For the Heroes live and the sky is bright,
  And the world is a braver world to-day.

ENGLAND DURING THE REBELLION.

GREAT BRITAIN.

From Geo. Bancroft's Address on Abraham Lincoln.

THERE was a kingdom whose people had in an eminent degree attained to freedom of industry and the security of person and property. Its middle-class rose to greatness. Out of that class sprung the noblest poets and philosophers, whose words built up the intellect of its people; skilful navigators to find out the many paths of the oceans; discoverers in natural science, whose inventions guided its industry to wealth, till it equalled any nation of the world in letters, and excelled all in trade and commerce. But its government was become a government of land, and not of men; every blade of grass was represented, but only a small minority of the people. In the transition from the feudal forms, the heads of the social organization freed themselves from the military services which were the conditions of their tenure, and, throwing the burden on the industrial classes, kept all the soil to themselves. Vast estates that had been managed by monasteries as endowments for religion and charity were appropriated to swell the wealth of courtiers and favorites; and the commons where the poor man once had his right of pasture were taken away, and, under forms of law, inclosed distributively within their own domain. Although no law forbade any inhabitant from purchasing land, the costliness of the transfer constituted a prohibition; so that it was the rule of that country that the plow should not be in the hands of its owner. The Church was rested on a contradiction, claiming to be an embodiment of absolute truth, and yet was a creature of the statute book.

The progress of time increased the terrible contrast between wealth and poverty; in their years of strength the laboring people, cut off from all share in governing the State, derived a scanty support from the severest toil, and had no hope for old age but in public charity or death. A grasping ambition had dotted the world with military posts, kept watch over our borders on the Northeast, at the Bermudas, in the West Indies, held the gates of the Pacific, of the Southern and of the Indian Oceans, hovered on our Northwest at Vancouver, held the whole of the newest continent, and the entrances to the old Mediterranean and Red Sea; and garrison forts all the way from Madras to China. That aristocracy had gazed with terror on the growth of a commonwealth where freeholds existed by the million, and religion was not in bondage to the State; and now they could not repress their joy at its perils. They had not one word of sympathy for the kind-hearted poor man's son whom America had chosen for her chief; they jeered at his large hands, and long feet, and ungainly stature; and the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs made haste to send word through the palaces of Europe that the great Republic was in its agony—that the Republic was no more—that a head-stone was all that remained due by the law of nations to "the late Union." But it is written: "Let the dead bury their dead:" they may not bury the living. Let the dead bury their dead: let a bill of reform remove the worn-out government of a class, and infuse new life into the British Constitution by confiding rightful power to the people.

But while the vitality of America is indestructible, the British government hurried to do what never before had been done by Christian powers, what was in direct conflict with its own exposition of public law in the time of our struggle for independence. Though the insurgent States had not a ship in an open harbor, it invested them with all the rights of a belligerent, even on the ocean; and this, too, when the rebellion was not only directed against the gentlest and most beneficent government on earth, without a shadow of justifiable cause, but when the rebellion was directed against human nature itself for the perpetual enslavement of a race. And the effect of this recognition was that acts in themselves piratical found shelter in British courts of law. The resources of British capitalists, their workshops, their armories, their private arsenals, their shipyards, were in league with the insurgents, and every British harbor in the wide world became a safe port for British ships, manned by British sailors and armed with British guns, to prey on our peaceful commerce; even on our ships coming from British ports freighted with British products, or that had carried gifts of grain to the English poor. The Prime Minister in the House of Commons, sustained by cheers, scoffed at the thought that their laws could be amended at our request, so as to preserve real neutrality; and to remonstrances, now owned to have been just, their Secretary answered that they could not change their laws *ad infinitum*.

The people of America then wished, as they always have wished, as they still wish, friendly relations with England; and no man in England or America can desire it more strongly than I. This country has always yearned for good relations with England. Thrice only in all its history has that yearning been fairly met—in the days of Hamden and Cromwell; again in the first ministry of the elder Pitt, and once, again, in the ministry of Shelburne. Not that there have not at all times been just men among the peers of Britain, like Halifax in the days of James II., or a Granville, an Argyle, or a Houghton in ours; and we cannot be indifferent to a country that produces statesmen like Cobden and Bright; but the best bower anchor of peace was the working-class of England, who suffered most from our civil war, but who, while they broke their diminished bread in sorrow always encouraged us to persevere.

* * * * * * *

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION.

The country had for its allies the river Mississippi, which would not be divided, and the range of mountains which carried the stronghold of the free through Western Virginia and Kentucky and Tennessee to the highlands of Alabama. But it invoked the still higher power of immortal justice. In ancient Greece, where servitude was the universal custom, it was held that if a child were to strike its parent, the slave should defend the parent, and by that act recover his freedom. After vain resistance, Lincoln, who had tried to solve the question by gradual emancipation, by colonization, and by compensation, at last saw that slavery must be abolished, or the Republic must die, and on the 1st day of January, 1863, he wrote liberty on the banners of the armies. When this proclamation, which struck the fetters from 3,000,000 of slaves, reached Europe, Lord Russell, a countryman of Milton and Wilberforce, eagerly put himself forward to speak of it in the name of mankind, saying: "It is of a very strange nature;" "a measure of war of a very questionable kind;" an act "of vengeance on the slave-owner" that does no more than "profess to emancipate slaves where the United States authorities cannot make emancipation a reality." Now, there was no part of the country embraced in the proclamation where the United States could not and did not make emancipation a reality. Those who saw Lincoln most frequently had never before heard him speak with bitterness of any human being, but he did not conceal how keenly he felt that he had been wronged by Lord Russell. And he wrote, in reply to another caviler: "The emancipation policy and the use of colored troops were the greatest blows yet dealt to the rebellion. The job was a great national one, and let none be slighted who have an honorable part in it. I hope peace will come soon, and come to stay; then will there be some black men who can remember that they have helped mankind to this great consummation."

PARLIAMENTARY ORATORY.

From the London Review.

"WHO is the first orator in England?" an egregiously stupid person once asked Lord Brougham. "Lord Derby is the *second*," was the self-conscious reply. The querist had, no doubt, forgotten the Henry Brougham who (chiefly heard in later days at Social Science Congresses) had once, as the defender of Queen Caroline and the champion of Parliamentary Reform and Negro Emancipation, made all England ring with his fame. Now, however, though Lord Derby does not stand second as an orator, even to Lord Brougham, in the general opinion of Englishmen, it is not at all so clear that the leader of the Tories is the first orator in the country. The "Rupert of debate," whose headlong charges in the Commons sometimes threw the Liberal ranks into confusion, suffers in the Lords not only from the influences of time, which has taken from the *timbre* of his once so ringing tones, but has also been gradually allowing some of his most remarkable powers to rust from disuse, partly because the atmosphere of the House of Lords is too cool for his native fire, and partly because he never finds in it a foeman worthy of his steel. To extinguish a pretentious Duke of Argyle by a felicitous anecdote, or to banter an amiable Lord Granville, whom the most venomous of opponents could scarcely wish to wound, or to tease Lord Russell by such happy epigrams as "meddle and muddle," is only to bring into play some of the minor qualities of that eloquence, limited perhaps in its range, but startling and exciting in its power, for which the Lord Stanley of a former day was so distinguished. But it is in the more popular branch of the Legislature that the gift of oratory can be exercised with most facility and freedom, as it is there also that it is most frequently called forth. Thither, therefore, must we turn to find the men whose voices in the days we live in oftenest stir the heart of the country to its lowest depths, and whose words, faithfully recorded, and carried to every corner of their own land and of the world, keep alive in the hearts of our people a traditional pride in their great representative assembly, and make its proceedings an object of unfailing interest and emulous imitation amongst all civilized races of "articulate-speaking men."

Mr. Gladstone possesses the *copia dicendi* in an eminent degree. His wealth of words is marvellous, and the unfaltering fluency with which they are poured forth. His ideas are also remarkable for clearness, order, and cohesion, and his general treatment of subjects may justly be called exhaustive. His divisions are sometimes a little too mechanical, and one cannot now hear of the regular "three courses" without a smile. A great element of his power as an orator is his intense subjectivity. He so identifies himself with his subject—he so makes of it, as it were, a cause to be contended for *tanquam pro aris et focis*, that the depth of his convictions for the time being gives to his matter a force, and to his manner an earnestness, that never fail to make an impression. But this subjectivity is also a source of weakness when it leads him to propound what seem to him political or economical truths with a dogmatical authority that will not brook correction or dissent. He seems to convey in so defiant a manner his settled and imperturbable assurance, that any one who presumes to differ from him must be wrong, and wrong with so hopeless an imbecility in error, that further argument would be wasted upon him, that he often fails to convert to his way of thinking men whom a more persuasive and condescending style of reasoning would easily gain over. It is unnecessary to say how successful has been his management of the public resources, or how frequently he has taken a Parliamentary majority almost by storm, and gained from all quarters the support of measures which had previously been regarded by many with disfavor. But, nevertheless, we do not consider his Budget speeches, as a rule, the best of his oratorical efforts; and the "City men," who sit them out, in order to have the first and fullest exposition of his intended policy, generally complain of weariness at the close. They were more satisfied, on the whole, with Sir George Lewis, wretched speaker as he was; but Mr. Goschen, whenever in the fulness of time he becomes Mr. Gladstone's Chancellor of the Exchequer, will be just the man for them. Mr. Gladstone may be called, we think, the Tennyson of finance; for he brings to his public expositions of it not only the powers of his reason, but also the resources of his imagination, and clothes them with a beauty of diction and richness of illustration which men delight to hear. Still it is not the less true that a simpler treatment would generally be more effective, that the subordinate parts of the subject are sometimes developed with too much diffuseness, and that the artist often prevails over the statesman in these elaborate efforts. Mr. Gladstone's delivery is very good. His voice, if not powerful, is clear and judiciously modulated, his enunciation distinct, though natural and unaffected, and his gesture, though sparingly used and not remarkably graceful, easy and appropriate.

Mr. Disraeli has few, if any, points of contact, and many of contrast, with his great antagonist. His great defect as an orator is the want of that subjectivity of which Mr. Gladstone has too much. That Mr. Disraeli is never in earnest, it would be unjust and absurd to think, and that there are many principles of public policy which he advocates from conviction, is very probable. But the appearance of hesitation and effort with which he often speaks gives a disinterested and impartial auditor the impression that his words are not so much the signs of his inward ideas, as attempts, sometimes painful and not quite successful, to give expression to opinions that are struggling for utterance in the minds of others; that he is speaking not exactly what he thinks, but rather what others may like to hear, or he may wish them to believe. We have no doubt, however, that this hesitation is often affected, and we have remarked it at times when it seemed carefully designed to give more effect to keen invective or biting sarcasm. On comparatively rare occasions, when there is some great personal interest in the debate, or when the peculiar characteristics of an opponent have led him upon some happy vein of humor, it is very pleasant to hear him. His manner, so often languid and listless, becomes warm and animated, his face is lit up with a glow of comic enjoyment, his words come out freely and with a brisker emphasis; and the unhappy wight upon whom he is giving for the time, as it were, an anatomical demonstration, wriggles uncomfortably in his seat, and adds, by his evident sensibility under the operation, to the general amusement. Not long ago, the *Times* reminded us of the confusion caused in Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet by the sort of moral psoriasis with which Lord Russell became afflicted in consequence of one of Mr. Disraeli's sallies. The incident illustrates what we have just been saying, and is worth recalling. When Lord Aberdeen formed his Coalition Ministry, Lord John of course could not be left out, and yet was not able to make up his mind for the acceptance of any subordinate office. It was arranged, then, that, for a time at least, he should have a seat in the Cabinet without office. But a man of so active a mind, and who was besides the leader of the Lower House, was sure to have a great deal of not merely private correspondence, and, after a while, an office was taken for him in Lancaster Place, near Somerset House. This was an opportunity for Mr. Disraeli, who very soon took occasion to deplore most feelingly in the House the equivocal and incongruous position which a statesman of the noble lord's great eminence and services occupied in the new Administration. He really could not imagine what the noble lord's duties were. He had heard of an office being taken for him in Lancaster Place. Perhaps the noble lord had been appointed toll-keeper of Waterloo bridge. The House was convulsed with merriment; but Lord John took the matter so seriously, that a new distribution of Government offices had to be made at once, with great indifference to the convenience of the parties displaced, and the Presidency of the Council was the salve with which the wounded dignity of the Great Unemployed was healed.

In the same high rank with Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, as a public speaker, Mr. Bright has undoubtedly a right to be placed. He does not speak nearly so often in Parliament as either, but his style of oratory, either there or at public meetings, abstracted from the subject-matter of his speeches, is as worthy of admiration and imitation as almost any model in our language. As distinguished from Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright's best efforts have more of Demosthenic power and concentration than of Ciceronian copiousness and finish. His English is pure, terse, nervous, and masculine, clothing earnest thoughts in vigorous and telling words. He does not always or often carry the House with him, because he too frequently shocks the strongest prejudices and most deeply-rooted convictions of the majority; but if his hearers could divest themselves of personal antipathies, they would be forced to own that no one among them better deserves the palm of eloquence. Separating the three great men we have named into a class by themselves, there are perhaps a dozen members, such as Sir Roundell Palmer, Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Lowe, and others, whom we would place in the second rank. Lord Stanley, though a first-class statesman, can scarcely be considered an orator at all, not merely from his physical defects (which we may observe in passing he would better overcome by cultivating the lower notes of his voice), but also from the too philosophical and didactic tone of his speeches. After all these there comes "a mob of gentlemen who speak with ease," but our subject does not, for the present, admit of further illustrations.

LET IT PASS.

Be not too swift to take offence;
  Let it pass!
Anger is a foe to sense;
  Let it pass!
Brood not darkly o'er a wrong
Which will disappear ere long;
Rather sing this cheery song—
  Let it pass!
  Let it pass!

Strife corrodes the purest mind,
  Let it pass!
As the unregarded wind,
  Let it pass!
Any vulgar souls that live
May condemn without reproeve;
'Tis the noble who forgive.
  Let it pass!
  Let it pass!

Echo not an angry word;
  Let it pass!
Think how often you have erred;
  Let it pass!
Since our days must pass away
Like the dew-drops on the spray;
Wherefore should our sorrow stay?
  Let it pass!
  Let it pass!

If for good you've taken ill,
  Let it pass!
Oh! be kind and gentle still;
  Let it pass!
Time at last makes all things straight;
Let us not resent, but wait,
And our triumphs shall be great;
  Let it pass!
  Let it pass!

Bid your anger to depart;
  Let it pass!
Lay these homely words to heart;
  Let it pass!
Follow not the giddy throng;
Better to be wronged than wrong;
Therefore sing the cheery song—
  Let it pass!
  Let it pass!

—*All the Year Round.*

ACROSS THE ATLANTIC IN FOUR DAYS.

PRESENT CONDITION OF THE "CIGAR SHIP."

THE present condition of the Winans "Cigar ship," now building in London, and of which accounts were published a long time ago, is thus described by the London *Morning Herald*:

"The general form of the cigar ship has been, as her name shows, compared with that of a cigar pointed off at both ends instead of one. A more homely, but, perhaps, more effective illustration is that of the unpleasant but favorite plaything of street boys, the 'tipcat.' Most of our landsmen readers will be more or less familiar with this simple but ingenious instrument of annoyance, and if they will fancy a Brobdignag 'cat' of slender make and tapering to an absolute needle-point at either end, they will have before their eyes the exact representation of the hull of the cigar ship. This hull, which is, of course, hollow, and is formed of iron, presenting a perfectly smooth and even surface, supports upon the upper side a small deck, occupying about half, or something less, of the extreme length, the tapering extremities projecting beyond it at either end. Unlike the hull itself, this deck is not exactly the same at each end, presenting a wedge-shaped front towards the bow, while at the stern it is rounded off American clipper fashion. Above the deck are to be seen the funnels, companion-houses, etc., but neither mast nor rigging of any kind whatever, the only means of locomotion possessed by the cigar ship being her engines, for which she can, according to estimate, carry coal enough for five days' consumption. Her extreme length is about two hundred and fifty feet, tapering gradually, as we have said, to a point almost as fine as that of a needle. The amount of accommodation is therefore extremely limited; and we believe it is not proposed to make any attempt at carrying cargo of any description, but to confine the vessel strictly to the passenger trade. Even then it is difficult to imagine, after due allowance for saloon and sleeping apartments, stores, berths for crew, etc., what space can be left for engines estimated to work up to two thousand horse power.

"The means of propulsion employed are two large screws, one at either end of the vessel, and placed within a very short distance of the extreme points, or at a distance of about one hundred and twenty feet from the machinery. These propellers are to be of great diameter and sharp pitch—the one pushing, the other pulling the vessel, and each showing half of its surface above the water. The estimated extreme speed *is about twenty-seven miles per hour*. A short distance from the propeller, and nearer to the centre of the vessel, is the rudder—one at each end—a broad iron plate like the rudder, or steering paddle, of the ancient galleys. These are also rather more than one hundred feet from the steering apparatus.

"Such is the general external appearance of this remarkable vessel, now almost ready for launching. In the water her line of flotation, according to the model of which we have before spoken, is exactly parallel with her longitudinal axis, the sharp point at either end being just level with the surface. Allowing sixteen feet as her extreme diameter, she will thus be raised in the centre eight feet above the water's edge; or with two feet more of bulwark, ten feet in all. We are free to confess that, with every possible desire to believe in the good qualities of a vessel which promises to bring us our American news in some three or four days, and to limit that dreadful channel business to within the hour, we are at loss to understand how, under these conditions, the cigar ship purposes to keep afloat. In perfectly smooth water we can imagine that she might, if successfully ballasted against the chance of rolling over and over, as would be of course her natural tendency, make something very like the estimated speed, though with what degree of comfort to the passengers, deprived by the construction of the vessel of all light or ventilation except such as can be obtained from the deck by means of skylights and windsails, and with two enormous propellers of severe pitch lashing the water at either end, is another question. The advantages, too, of being cooped up in such extremely close quarters, with an engine of this enormous power, may also be open to question, even under the most favorable circumstances.

"But the real difficulties of the cigar ship, as of most others, must commence with the first symptoms of a breeze. Imagine a vessel of this construction travelling at the rate of five-and-twenty miles an hour—the minimum rate, be it remembered, for the New York passage, on account of the consumption of coal—meeting in mid-ocean one of the westerly gales now careering across the Atlantic. In front of her is a wall of water twenty feet high, travelling at the rate of a dozen miles an hour. Between them they meet at a speed of forty miles. There is no 'bow' to lift her over the obstacle. Right into it she plunges, like a harpoon into a whale's back, the whole force of the blow being met by the propeller, which, however severe may be its pitch, cannot present anything very much better than an almost flat surface to the shock. What chance the blades would have of surviving any very long succession of such shocks is a matter of simple calculation, and one into which the engineers have no doubt fully entered."

NOT BRITISH SUBJECTS!—It will be remembered that Lord Clarendon informed Mr. Adams that the naval officer at Liverpool was satisfied that none of the Shenandoah's men were British subjects, and that therefore no steps could be taken against them. Mr. Chandler of Michigan, in his remarks in the Senate on Monday, hit off this part of the business very well:

"These British subjects were called upon the deck of the Shenandoah and asked this question: 'Michael O'Flanigan, are you a British subject?' 'No, by jabers, I am a Dutchman.' (Laughter.) The intonation was strongly Irish. 'McDonald, are you a British subject?' 'Nau, I am a Spaniard.' (Renewed laughter.) And so every one of these men was turned loose without even a reprimand to go again and prey upon American commerce; and now we are informed that further negotiation would be deemed by Her Majesty's government as of no advantage; no good result can follow the prolongation of the controversy. I agree with the British Minister that no good result can follow the further continuation of that controversy."

THE WASHINGTON LETTER IN COURT.

[A case tried last week in New York before the Supreme Court.]

THE Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the city of New York *vs.* De Witt C. Lent, E. R. Bangs, A. W. Merwin, and another.—This action was brought to recover the possession of an autograph letter written by Gen. Geo. Washington in 1785, addressed to the Mayor, Recorder, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the city of New York. The complaint asks to have the letter returned, or that plaintiffs be permitted to recover of defendants the value thereof, which they allege to be $2,500. The defendants in their answer allege that Bangs, Merwin, and the last defendant therein named, were auctioneers in this city, doing business as such, under the firm name of Bangs, Merwin & Co.; that some time prior to the year 1834, one John Allan become legally possessed of the autograph letter in question. That in November, 1863, said Allan died, and that one Margaret Stewart, daughter of Allan, as his executrix, became possessed thereof. Mrs. Stewart, it seems, took this letter, with a large number of others, to Messrs. Bangs and Merwin, to sell. Allan in his lifetime was a gatherer of old and rare books, pictures, coins, and autograph letters, and it seems that property of this character, to the value of near $40,000, was put into the store of Bangs and Merwin; they to sell them in the usual manner. The defendant Lent attended the sale, bid off the letter for $2,050, but omitted to pay anything on his purchase. He kept the letter two days, and then returned it to the auctioneers, with the request that they would rescind the sale. This they refused to do. Lent then asked them to retain possession of it and sell it, if possible, on his account. Meanwhile the city authorities learned that this letter was on exhibition, and at once laid claim to it. They insisted that it was the property of the city, that it had been wrongfully taken from their possession, and demanded its return. This being refused, an action was brought to recover its possession or the value of it. It will be seen from this statement that Mrs. Stewart is the real party defendant in interest. The defendant, among other things, set up as defences the statute of limitations—that is, that more than six years had elapsed after the cause of action arose, and before the commencement of the suit. They also alleged that the deceased man Allan had the peaceable possession of the letter for more than thirty years.

The following is a *verbatim et literatum* copy of the letter in suit, as certified by Mr. David T. Valentine, the venerable Clerk of the Common Council; also an account of the proceedings of the Common Council when the letter was received:

COPY OF WASHINGTON'S LETTER.

City of New York, ss.—At a Common Council held at the Almshouse of this city, on Tuesday, the 2d of May, 1785—present, James Duane, Esq., Mayor; Alvin P. Lott, John Broome, Wm. W. Gilbert, Wm. Neiland, Esq.; Alderman Abram Van Gelder, George Janeway, Daniel Phoenix, Jonr. Lawrence, Aists. Mr. Mayor produced to the Board a letter from his Excellency Gen. Washington, covering his answer to the address of the Corporation of the 2d of December last, which said answer is in the words following, namely:

To the Honorable the Mayor, Recorder, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the city of New York:

GENTLEMEN: I received your address and the freedom of the city, with which you have been pleased to present me in a golden box, with the sensibility and gratitude which such distinguished honors have claim to. The flattering expression of both, stamps value on the acts, and calls for stronger language than I am master of, to convey my sense of the obligation in adequate terms. To have had the good fortune, amidst the vicissitudes of a long and arduous contest, never to have known a moment when I did not possess the confidence and esteem of my country, and that my conduct should have met the approbation and obtained the affectionate reward of the State of New York (where difficulties were numerous and complicated) may be ascribed more to the effect of Divine wisdom which had disposed the minds of the people, harrassed on all sides, to make allowances for the embarrassments of my situation, while with fortitude and patience they sustained the loss of their capitol and valuable part of their territory, and to the liberal sentiments and great exertion of her virtuous citizens, than to any merit of mine. The reflection of those things now, after the many hours of anxious solicitation which all of us have had, is as pleasing as our embarrassments at the moment we encountered them were distressing, and must console us for past sufferings and perplexities. I pray that Heaven may bestow its choicest blessings on your city—that the devastation of war in which you found it may soon be without a trace; that a well regulated and beneficial commerce may enrich all your citizens, and that your State (at present the seat of the Empire) may set such examples of wisdom and liberality as shall have a tendency to strengthen and give permanency to the Union at home, and credit and respectability to it abroad—the accomplishment whereof is a remaining wish and the primary object of all my desires.

GO. WASHINGTON.

The certificate of Mr. Valentine is dated October 15, 1864.

The Court, in charging the jury, said that if they believed from the testimony that Allan or his representative came into possession of the letter wrongfully, the defence as to the statute of limitations was a good one, and the plaintiffs in that event could not recover; but if, on the contrary, it had been loaned to Allan, or if in any other way he had gained possession of it legally; the defence of the statute of limitations was no bar to the action. The jury, after an absence of nearly three hours, returned into Court with the following verdict: "The jury find for the plaintiffs, and assess the damages for the detention of the letter at six cents; and they assess the value of the letter at $2,050." This is the amount that Mr. Lent agreed to pay for it when he bought it of the auctioneers.

ARTISTIC ANATOMY.

From the Evening Post.

As Dr. Rimmer, the celebrated teacher of artistic anatomy, has come to New York, the following extract from a private letter, describing his Boston art classes, may be interesting to our readers, and particularly to students of art:

"Passing the doorkeeper, one enters a large room, at the end of which is a platform, with a large drawing board and a skeleton. Two statues are at the sides; one, a gladiator with a gash through his helmet, which makes him reel and fall—the strong sword arm powerless now, and the head swimming as the whole body is twisted; a position showing well the different action of the opposed sets of muscles, which almost move under the skin that is here tense over life-like anatomical detail, there relaxed in soft folds—a position in which the French critics, who declared the figure to be cast from life because of the correctness of detail, could not place a model.

"The other statue is a youthful and smoothly graceful figure of 'heroic size,' with a droll eagle's head on the neck.

"In another place is a bust of St. Stephen, in whose upturned face are mingled the agony and the ecstacy of the martyr. The original in granite is now in Italy, and has gained the name of the 'Christian Laccoon.'

"A varied assembly of people are seated at rows of drawing desks, in respectful silence, with pencils and portfolios. Represented here, one sees the artist, whose works have for years held an honored position in our collections; the art student—some indeed, whose desire for these advantages has drawn them from New York and other cities, converging to 'the Hub;' the medical student, who has learned the value of a knowledge of the human figure in action as well as on the dissecting-table; the practical engraver and designer; the matron who would renew a taste for art which suffers from disuse; and not least, in respect to number or appearance, the young miss, who has 'so much talent for drawing!' and who lives on Beacon street.

"At the Board, armed with charcoal and rubbing cloth, stands a man of grave, earnest manner, drawing and explaining—then, passing among the students who are copying and taking notes 'Next!' says he, quietly. And now the pencils are working as fast as fingers can make them. The merciless cloth is approaching the drawing—some one gives a little signal of distress—the doctor pauses pleasantly for a moment, for the slower draughts; man to add some rapid strokes. A few sweeps of the cloth, and then another drawing is begun—sometimes with care and correctness — more frequently seeming hardly like drawing—rather like peeling off a covering which hides the work beneath, so easily does it grow as his hand moves over the board.

"It may be a figure of light graceful proportions, with a beautiful roundness to the limbs, although only in outline—or a burly Hercules, knotty with muscle.

"Perhaps it is a colossal foot-front view.

"'The inner ankle is higher than the outer,' says the doctor and a line is dashed across the top of the foot, passing through the two prominences of the ankle bones, forming, with the ground, an angle which the eye does not easily forget.

"'Therefore,' continues he, 'the foot can be turned upward and inward. When the foot is forced much outward, the *fibula* is broken by the strain against the *maleolus extermus*.'

"A few minutes pass, while Dr. Rimmer is rubbing over the board at a great rate with the flat side of a charcoal crayon.

"'What can be coming now?'

"'Ah!'

"He steps aside, and there is a powerful picture of a battle-field at twilight, the figures of wounded and dead relieved against the evening sky.

"'You should have a week to copy such a thing!' whispers an artist, disappointedly, as it is erased to make room for another."

ECONOMY IN FRANCE.

AMERICANS have not the first notions of economy. They make money with little trouble, and spend it without counting. In this it would be well if they took a few lessons, and in Europe they would have examples *ad infinitum* if they mingled with the people; but they learn no more of the daily habits and interior life of those among whom they travel than if they staid at home. They learn to practice the follies and not the wisdom. Not how they shall make money, but how they shall contrive to live on what they have, is the question with Europeans; how, by hook and by crook they shall make the ends of the year meet, and they have no false shame about exhibiting all these hooks and crooks. If one takes a house all of his acquaintances ask how much he paid for it, how much income he has, how much it cost him for dress, food, and all the various necessaries of life; and then they *calculate* to see if he can save anything. An American feels insulted by one such question. If a lady buys a dress, her friends demand how much it cost. They take the material in their hands, rub it between their fingers, pronounce upon its strength and fineness, and whether it is a good bargain. A French lady is happy to give the most minute information upon all the details of her *menage*, and would not be offended if asked how much the dinner cost to which she had invited you.

We know families in American cities who do not think it possible to have a good dinner for less than two dollars each person; but we know families in Paris who keep two or three carriages, two coachmen, two valets, two cooks, and three chambermaids, who allow only sixty cents each person *per day* for food, and live very well. The chief cook is told how much he may spend for the table, and no professed cook takes a place where he can't make a good profit with the sum allowed him. There are thousands of families in Paris who live on salaries of four, six, and eight hundred dollars a year, who never spend more than ten dollars a month on the table. This will seem incredible, but we have lived in such families and shared these meals, which were sufficient and good. Not a single item is provided until the cost has been counted. But the most important article with English and Americans is never reckoned by the French people. This is time. They turn and putter all day in half a bushel, while an American would prefer some hard labor that would yield him more money, and save him the necessity of such economy; and fortunately he lives in a country where this decision is at his choice. But here labor is not free, and therefore money is not plenty, and, what is worse, labor is not honorable.—*Paris Cor. Chicago Republican.*

SAND-MARTINS.

I PASSED an inland cliff precipitate:
  From tiny caves peeped many a sooty poll;
In each a mother martin sat elate,
  And of the news delivered her small soul.

Fantastic chatter! hasty, glad, and gay,
  Whereof the meaning was not ill to tell:—
"Gossip, how wags the world with you to-day?"
  "Gossip, the world wags well, the world wags well."

And listening, I was sure their little ones
  Were in the bird-talk, and discourse was made
Concerning hot sea-flights, and tropic suns,
  For a clear sultriness the tune conveyed;—

And visions of the sky as of a cup
  Hailing down light on pagan Pharaoh's sand;
And quivering air-waves trembling up and up,
  And blank stone-faces marvellously bland;—

When should the young be fledged, and with them hie
  Where costly day drops down in crimson light;
Fortunate countries of the fire-fly,
  Swarm with blue diamonds all the sultry night,

And the immortal moon takes turn with them;
  When should they pass again by that red land
Where lovely mirage works a broidered hem
  To fringe with phantom palms a robe of sand;—

When should they dip their breasts again and play
  In slumberous azure pools clear as the air,
Where rosy-winged flamingoes fish all day,
  Stalking amid the lotus-blossoms fair;—

Then over podded tamarinds bear their flight,
  While cassias feed the wind with spiceries;
And so betake them to a south sea-bight,
  To gossip in the crowns of cocoa-trees,

Whose roots are in the spray. O haply there,
  Some dawn, white-winged, they might chance to find
A frigate standing in to make more fair
  The loneliness unaltered of mankind.

A frigate come to water. Nuts would fall,
  And nimble feet would climb the flower-flushed strand,
And northern talk would ring, and therewithal
  The martins would desire the cool north land,

And all would be as it had been before.
  Again at eve there would be news to tell;
Who passed should hear them chant it o'er and o'er,
  "Gossip, how wags the world?" "Well, Gossip, well!"

JEAN INGELOW.

AN ASPIRANT FOR AUTHORSHIP.—One day I was told a gentleman had called and waited for me in the drawing-room. As I entered, he was gazing from a window in the shadow of a damask curtain, which threw a warm tint upon as strongly-moulded a face as I remember to have seen in one so young. His forehead was compactly rounded, his hair curly and raven, and his eye dark and luminous. As I approached, he handed me a note of introduction from a friend, refused the proffered seat, and wore so earnest and grave an expression that I almost thought he was the bearer of a challenge. "Sir," he began, "I have come to you for sympathy in a great undertaking. I wish to be cheered in a mission, encouraged in a career, advised in an experiment!" There was a certain wildness in the manner of this sententious address which breathed of an excited fancy. I expressed a willingness to aid him to the extent of my humble ability. He drew a thick packet from his coat, and proceeded: "I am a native of a little village in a neighboring State. My father is an agriculturist, and has endeavored to render me content with that lot; but there is something *here*"—and he laid a large, red hand on his capacious breast—"that rebels against the decree. I aspire to the honors of literature. I long to utter myself to the world. Here is a tragedy and some lyrics; and I have come to town to test my fortune as an author." I saw that he was an enthusiast, and calmly pointed out the obstacles to success. He became impatient. I enlarged on the healthfulness and wisdom of a country life, on the precarious subsistence incident to pencraft. His eye flashed with anger. I urged him to consider well the risk he incurred, the danger of failure, the advantages of a reliable vocation, the comfort of an independent though secluded existence. He advanced towards me with an indignant stride. "Sir!" he exclaimed, "I have been misinformed; you are not the man I took you for; farewell, forever!" and he rushed from the house. Six months had elapsed, and I was sitting over a book in my quiet room one day, when a terrific knock at the door aroused me, and the instant after the stranger entered and impetuously grasped my hand. "Sir—my dear friend, I mean"—he said, "I have done you injustice, and I have come to apologize. For a month after our former interview, I passed a feverish novitiate, hawking my manuscripts around, deceived by plausible members of the trade, snubbed by managers, frozen out of the sanctums of editors, yawned at by casual audiences, baffled at every turn, until worn out, mortified, and despairing, I went home. The feel of the turf, the breath of the wind, the lowing of the kine, the very scent of hay, was refreshing. I thought over your counsel, and found it true. I now farm the paternal acres on shares, write verses during the long winter evenings, lead the choir on Sundays, am to marry the pride of the village next week, and am here to beg your pardon and invite you to my wedding."—*Tuckerman's Criterion.*

A MOST novel and amusing form of presenting a Christmas gift we heard of in the case of a pastor who missed his stockings, and, after diligent search through the house and much inquiry, was informed that they were last seen hanging outside of the window. On opening it, the missing articles were discovered on the horns of a new milch cow. Who wouldn't be a pastor—on Christmas Day?

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

CONSTITUTION WATER

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

THE ONLY REMEDY KNOWN FOR

DIABETES,

Stone in the bladder, Calculus, Gravel, Brick Dust Deposit, and Mucous or Milky Discharges after urinating, Irritation of the Neck of the Bladder, Inflammation of the Kidneys, Catarrh of the Bladder, Strangury and Burning, or Painful Urinating.

For these diseases it is truly a sovereign remedy, and too much cannot be said in its praise. A single dose has been known to relieve the most urgent symptoms.

Are you troubled with that distressing pain in the small of the back and through the hips? A teaspoonful a day of the Constitution Water will relieve you like magic.

PHYSICIANS

have long since given up the use of buchu, cubebs and juniper in the treatment of these diseases, and only use them for the want of a better remedy.

CONSTITUTION WATER

has proved itself equal to the task that has devolved upon it.

DIURETICS

irritate and drench the kidneys, and by constant use soon lead to chronic degeneration and confirmed disease.

We present the Constitution Water to the public with the conviction that it has no equal in relieving the ches of diseases for which it has been found so eminently successful for curing; and we trust that we shall be rewarded for our efforts in placing so valuable a remedy in a form to meet the requirements of patie.t and physician.

Dysmenorrhœa and Menorrhagia will be speedily cured by the Constitution Water.

That disease known as Falling of the Womb, which is the result of a relaxation of the ligaments of that organ, and is known by a sense of heaviness and dragging pains in the back and sides and at times accompanied by sharp, lancinating